IMPRIMATUR,

Jan. 23.
167$\frac{3}{4}$

Sam. Parker.

IMPRIMATUR,

Jan. 23.
167$\frac{3}{4}$

Sam. Parker.

Libertas Ecclesiastica,

COL. COLL.
LIBRARY
N. YORK.

OR, A

DISCOURSE,

VINDICATING

The Lawfulness of those things, which are chiefly excepted against in the Church of *England*,

Especially in its

Liturgie and *Worship.*

And manifesting their agreeableness with the Doctrine and practice both of Ancient and Modern Churches.

By Rev. *WILLIAM FALKNER*, Preacher at St *Nicholas*, in *Lyn Regis*.

The Third Edition Corrected.

LONDON,
Printed by *J. M.* for *Walter Kettilby*, at the *Bishops-Head* in St. *Paul's Church-Yard*, 1677.

have edition 1644

LIBRARY OF THE
Union Theological Seminary
NEW YORK CITY
PRESENTED BY
Columbia University Library
APR 1 1912

TO

The most Reverend Father in God, *Gilbert* by Divine Providence, Lord Archbishop of *Canterbury*, Primate of all *England*, and Metropolitan, and one of His Majesties most Honourable Privy Council, *&c.*

May it please your Grace,

YOur Grace *being a Person of such singular Eminency in the* Church of England, *I humbly crave leave to present to your hands this following Discourse, which contains a Vindication of the* Publick Worship *of our Church, from those exceptions which by Dissenters have been made against it. And the main Design of this Treatise being to promote Christian Unity, by representing the evil consequences of such unnecessary Discords and Schisms, and the great unrea-*

21440

reasonableness of those pretences, which have been alledged for their Justification; it will not, I hope, be judged incongruous, that it should address it self to your Grace, *whose high Office in the Church tendeth to advance the Unity thereof, and entitleth you to the publick Patronage of* Peace *and* Truth.

I cannot doubt your Graces *approbation of this design, which is at all times useful, but more especially in this present Juncture of Affairs, if God please to grant success, which is my earnest prayer. For as all good men who prefer Truth and the sincere practice of Piety before their own prejudices, wills, and passions, cannot but approve of such honest endeavours to rectifie mistakes, and compose the minds of men to peace; so all who are pious and wise cannot but discern a greater necessity, and a more particular obligation at this time to silence all these little janglings and quarrels,*

quarrels, if they have any reſpect to the main intereſt and concerns of the Reformed Profeſſion.

And I hope, My Lord, *that the late Alarm we had from our common Enemies, may open mens eyes to ſee the miſchief of rending the Church, into ſo many Factions, and may diſpoſe them to receive juſt and reaſonable ſatisfaction. And though what hath been excellently performed by former Writers upon this Subject be ſufficiently ſatisfactory, yet my labour herein may not be wholly uſeleſs, conſidering the humor of this Age, which is more apt to read new Books than to ſeek for old ones.*

But though the cauſe I have undertaken deſerves your Graces *Patronage, yet my own perſonal defects might juſtly have diſcouraged me, from preſenting this diſcourſe to one of ſo high Dignity, and ſo great a Judgment; had not the cauſe it ſelf been ſo good, that it needed no Art*

and Colours to ſet it off, but it is ſufficiently juſtified, when it is rightly repreſented and underſtood; and your Graces Candour *and* Clemency *ſo well known, as to encourage me to hope for a favourable Acceptance; which is the only thing I beg in this humble Addreſs unto your* Grace, *favourably to accept of this ſmall Preſent from him, who unfeignedly prayeth for your* Graces *proſperity, and is intirely devoted to the ſervice and intereſt of Truth and Peace, and*

Humbly honoureth your Grace

with all due Obſervance,

W. Falkner.

THE

THE PREFACE TO THE READER.

Christian Reader,

THE design of this discourse being to *remove* or at least to *allay* those fierce contentions about the external forms of worship, to which we owe all those unhappy Schisms, which good men so heartily bewail, it was necessary in order to this end to rectifie those *mistakes* and *prejudices*, which abuse well-minded men, who have not throughly consider'd things; and to correct those corrupt passions, that quarrelsom and contentious humour, which perverts others.

To these two causes we owe most of our present disorders, & it is too evident, what hand the latter of these has had in them, while divers Persons wanting a due sense of the evil and danger of these discords, and a due regard to the Peace and Unity of the Church, have been too zealous and forward to maintain and promote such dissentions, thereby to serve the *Interest* of their own *parties*, and to oppose the settlement of the Church upon sure and lasting principles: now I had no other way

way of dealing with these men, but to convince them of the great evil of such contentions, and how much it is the duty of every Christian to study Peace and Unity. For there is nothing more evident, than that mens minds are strangely byassed by their affections and Interests, and clouded by passion, and therefore *while they are so peremptorily resolved upon their way, while they are so fond of their own Inventions, while they are devoted to the service of a Party, and account those men their Enemies, who should rule and govern them, and inform them better; there is no expectation, that reason and argument should prevail with them.*

And if those arguments, which I have made use of for this purpose, should be effectual to calm the passions of men, and to work in them a Christian and peaceable temper of mind, I can easily foretel the success of my following discourse, the design of which is to rectifie those mistakes and misapprehensions, which some men labour under, which either concern the particular *Rites* and *Offices* of our Church, or the *General rule of duty, or Ecclesiastical liberty*, by which the Church must be directed and guided in matters of order.

The first hath occasion'd various ex-

ceptions

ceptions againſt ſome Rites and Ceremonies, and particular paſſages in our forms of Prayer, and I have ſpent great part of this Treatiſe in anſwering ſuch objections, by which I hope it will appear, what little reaſon there is to diſturb the Peace of the Church, and to ſeparate from our Communion upon ſuch pretences.

Concerning the *General Rule*, which ought ever to be obſerved in the Church about matters of order, there are ſome, who will allow nothing (except ſome few circumſtances) to be determined by the Authority of the Church, unleſs it be directly enjoyned by a particular divine Inſtitution; and for a more plauſible colour they reject all ſuch rules of order or regular adminiſtration, under the terms of *unſcriptural conditions of Communion.* But in anſwer to this I have made it appear to be an unjuſt and unreaſonable exception againſt the eſtabliſht order of any Church, that there are ſome things determined and appointed by the Authority of Superiours, which have always been accounted of an *Indifferent* nature, and are indeed the proper matters of *Eccleſiaſtical Liberty*: And I hope, I have abundantly proved to the ſatisfaction of all ſober inquirers, that prudent and well ordered Eccleſiaſtical Conſtitutions and appointments

pointments for the promoting order and decency, and the advancement of Religion and Piety, are very allowable and unblameable; nay that it is impoſſible, that any publick worſhip or ſervice of God can be performed, unleſs ſome things in thoſe adminiſtrations, not particularly commanded by God, be determined either *by publick Authority*, or by *common agreement*, which makes it neceſſary for all men either to relinquiſh this principle, or which is more ſhameful, to contradict it in their practice.

I am not unſenſible, what rewards ſuch attempts, as this, commonly meet with from men of diſtemper'd minds, and ungovern'd paſſions: I have carefully avoided all juſt occaſions of offence, as hoping, that I may the more effectually perſwade, the leſs I anger them; but if nothing will ſecure me from Invectives and Calumnies, I muſt be contented with my portion, and appeal to the judgment of more candid and impartial Readers, and ſatisfie my ſelf with the Teſtimony of God and my own Conſcience of the honeſty of my intentions and deſign in this work, leaving the ſucceſs of it to the Divine Providence, with my hearty and ſerious Prayers, that it may be for the publick benefit of the Church.

Farewel.

THE CONTENTS.

THE FIRST BOOK.

Chap. 1. The diſagreements about Conformity are of great concernment. Sect. 1. *Of the effects of theſe Diſſentions as to the diſpoſitions of the people.* Sect. 2. *That theſe Contentions diſadvantage Chriſtianity, and gratifie Popery and Irreligion.* Sect. 3. *Of the dangerous loſs of the Churches Peace and Unity by this Controverſie, and of the Sin of* Schiſm. Sect. 4. *Some falſe Conceptions of Schiſm refuted.* Sect. 5. *Of the duty of Obedience to Rulers and Governours, and the due exerciſe of the Miniſterial Function, which is herein concerned.* Sect. 6. *A Propoſal touching due conſiderateneſs, and the deſign of this Treatiſe manifeſted.*

Chap. 2. Of the ſolemn League & Covenant. Sect. 1. *Of an* unlawful Oath in it ſelf, *and that that Oath was ſuch, with reſpect to its Matter, and Form, and Impoſition.* Sect. 2. *That the Covenant cannot oblige any Perſon to endeavour any alteration of the Government of the Church, proved by four Rules.*

Chap.

Chap. 3. Of the Declaration and Subſcription refering to the Liturgy.

The common uſe of ſuch acknowledgments, &c. *the true ſenſe of declaring* unfeigned aſſent and conſent.

Chap. 4. Of the Liturgy and the ordinary Service appointed therein.

Sect. 1. *The Lawfulneſs, Antiquity, and Expediency of* Set-Forms. Sect. 2. *Objections againſt Set-Forms anſwered.* Sect. 3. *Of the Compoſure of the Prayers in our Liturgie; chiefly of Reſponſals and ſhort Prayers.* Sect. 4. *Of the Doxologie*, Athanaſian *Creed, and ſome particular expreſſions in the Litany.* Sect. 5. *Conſiderations concerning the publick reading the Apocryphal Chapters.* Sect. 6. *The Objections from the matter of the Apocrypha diſcuſſed.* Sect. 7. *Conſiderations about the Tranſlation of the Pſalms uſed in the Liturgie.* Sect. 8. *Of Holy-Days or Feſtivals.*

Chap. 5. Of the particular Offices in the Liturgy.

Sect. 1. *Of the direction for Communicants receiving the Lords Supper.* Sect. 2. *Of ſome other things in the Communion Office.* Sect. 3. *Of the* ſaving Regeneration *of Infants in Baptiſm, and the grounds upon which it may be aſſerted.* Sect. 4. *The Doctrine of the ancient,*

ent, and divers Reformed Churches herein obſerved. Sect. 5. *The Objections againſt the ſaving Regeneration of Infants in Baptiſm conſidered.* Sect. 6. *Of the Notion of* viſible Regeneration *in Baptiſm.* Sect. 7. *Of Sureties, and ſome other things in the Office for Baptiſm.* Sect. 8. *Of the Office for Confirmation, and that for Marriage.* Sect. 9. *Of the Communion of the Sick, and the Office for Burial.*

The Second Book.

Chap. 1. The lawful Uſe of ſome Ceremonies in the Chriſtian Church aſſerted.
Sect. 1. *What we are here to underſtand by Ceremonies.* Sect. 2. *The firſt Argument for the lawfulneſs of Eccleſiaſtical Rites, from the liberty therein allowed to the Jewiſh Church.* Sect. 3. Eccleſiaſtical Conſtitutions *concerning external Rites, warranted by the Apoſtolical Doctrine and Practice.* Sect. 4. *The Practice and Judgment of the Primitive, and many Proteſtant Churches concerning Ceremonies.* Sect. 5. *The ill conſequences of denying the lawfulneſs of all Eccleſiaſtical Rites and Conſtitutions in things indifferent.* Sect. 6. *Some Objections from Reaſon and from the Old Teſtament examined.*

amined. Sect. 7. *Other Objections from the New Teſtament cleared.*

Chap. 2. Of Eccleſiaſtical Appointments and conſtitutions under ſome ſpecial Conſiderations.

Sect. 1. *Of external Rites conſidered as* ſignificant. Sect. 2. *Of Eccleſiaſtical Appointments, conſidered as* impoſed *and enjoined.* Sect. 3. *Of Eccleſiaſtical Conſtitutions about things* ſcrupled. Sect. 4. *Of Eccleſiaſtical Rites, which have been* abuſed *in any corrupt way of Worſhip.*

Chap. 3. Of devout and becoming Geſtures in the Service of God.

Sect. 1. *Of the Geſture at Prayer, Praiſe, and Chriſtian Profeſſion of Faith.* Sect. 2. *Of ſtanding up at the Goſpel.* Sect. 3. *Of the fitneſs of* Kneeling *at the Communion: and the geſture at the Inſtitution of that Sacrament conſidered.* Sect. 4. *Of the Communion-geſture obſerved in the Chriſtian Church, both in the purer and the more degenerate times thereof.*

Chap. 4. Of other particular Rites appointed in the Church of *England.*

Sect. 1. *Of the* Surpleſs. Sect. 2. *Of the ſign of the* Croſs *in the Office for Baptiſm.* Sect. 3. *Of* laying on hands *in Confirmation.* Sect. 4. *Of the* Ring *in Marriage. And the Concluſion.*

Libertas

Libertas Eccleſiaſtica.

The Firſt BOOK.

CHAP. I.

Shewing the diſagreements about Conformity, *to be of great concernment.*

SECT. I.

Of the effects of theſe oppoſitions, as to the diſpoſitions of the people.

1. THE diſcerning the weightineſs of any matter under preſent circumſtances, doth not only depend upon the *direct inſpection* into the thing it ſelf, but alſo upon a more *comprehenſive view* of it, as it taketh in all its neceſſary conſequents and attendents. If the Sea bank be broken, and carried

away by an overflowing rage of Waters, the loſs would be *fondly eſtimated*, by conſidering only the *value of ſo much earth* as would make it up: and it would be ſome degrees below common folly, to imagine that the advantage of *reſpiration* in man, is a thing wholly inconſiderable, becauſe the matter of it is only a little *ordinary air*: for according to that of *Damaſcen*, Μικρὸν ὑ μικρὸν ὄλαν οὐς μέγα ἐκφέρει, a *ſmall matter* is then *no ſmall matter*, when it bringeth in a great conſequent.

2. Nor can we eaſily find a more full inſtance hereof, than in the preſent ſubject of *Conformity*. For the *diſcovering* how great the *good or evil* is, which dependeth thereupon, is not to be concluded, chiefly from the bare eyeing the things required and appointed, many of which are in their own nature things *indifferent*; but from obſerving its neceſſary attendants, which are of very high conſequence and great concernment. Wherefore I ſhall firſt take an account, what *great* and *manifold evils* flow from theſe *diſſentions*, and oppoſitions, whereby this will appear to be a matter deſerving ſerious conſideration, and that the maintaining ſuch diſſentions, unleſs they proceed upon neceſſary and juſtifiable grounds,

grounds, (which I ſhall examine) is *upon many weighty accounts* utterly diſallowable, and greatly condemnable.

3. From theſe contentions doth ſpring much want of *Chriſtian love*, and that kindneſs of affection, which our *Lord* requireth, and by many cogent arguments enforceth upon his Diſciples; and inſtead thereof we may hear many *contemptuous*, *ſcoffing* and *ſcorning* expreſſions, which are an evidence of a frothy and airy vanity and haughtineſs of mind, unſuitable to the *gravity and humility* of the *Chriſtian Spirit*. Yea, hence much diſcourſe of many men religiouſly diſpoſed, which might be well *improved* to a pious *proficiency in the Chriſtian life*, runneth up into the wilder branches of *contention*; and that *zeal* which might be well employed, is oft miſ-ſpent in cheriſhing the flames of *paſſionate heats*, and *heart-burnings*, accompanied with too much *bitterneſs*, and becometh that πικρὸς ζῆλος which St. *James* ſo ſharply cenſureth and condemneth, as being manifeſtly oppoſite to thoſe religious practices unto which Chriſtians are directed from above. *James* 3. 14, 15.

4. This oppoſition hath alſo too much promoted many *ſinful prejudices* in the ſpirits of Men: hence ſome have their

minds unreaſonably prepoſſeſſed, with ſo much averſeneſs towards, and diſeſteem of the publick adminiſtrations of Gods ſervice, as *indiſpoſeth* them for a devout performance of that worſhip, and *hindreth* the *vigorous exerciſe* of Chriſtian Graces in their joyning therein, to the decay of Piety. It occaſioneth others to be *neglectful* in their *attendance*, even upon the holy Sacramental Inſtitutions of our bleſſed Saviour; and this ſame ſin of prejudice ſometimes ruleth ſo far, as to promote *raſhneſs* of *judgment* and great cenſoriouſneſs of others, contrary to the Goſpel rule, and therein blindeth mens minds, and hurrieth their paſſions into great exceſſes. By all which things *God* is diſpleaſed, and *Chriſtian Charity* is violated, but the greateſt hurt befalleth themſelves, by their *ſlighting the advantages of a Religious life*, and either frequently neglecting, or negligently performing the publick duties of Gods worſhip, and not entertaining the means of their Salvation; which includeth alſo a want of due reſpect unto God and his grace.

5. And what *ſtrange apprehenſions* this Sin is prone to raiſe of the worthieſt men, may be beſt diſcovered in ſome particular inſtances. Hereby they who could not

not but admire the Works and Doctrine of *Christ*, did both *reject him*, and cauſeleſly *cenſure him*, as *breaking the Sabbath*, *blaſphemirg God*, *being an Enemy to* Cæſar, *and a greater friend to Publicans and Sinners* than was allowable, and at laſt cryed out, *Crucify him*, *Crucify him*. Hence alſo the ſame perſons who ſo exceſſively admired *Paul* and *Barnabas* at *Lyſtra*, being poſſeſſed with prejudice by the Jews perſwaſion, were well pleaſed that they ſhould be ſtoned to Death, and thereupon they *rejected that Doctrine* which the Apoſtles preached. *Act.* 14. 8. 19.

6. Upon the like ungrounded *diſaffection*, St. *Baſil* met with no better reputation at *Neocæſarea* (the place of his Fathers Family) than to be branded for an *Heretick*: and his great Friend *Gr. Nazianzen* at his firſt coming to *Conſtantinople* (the City being in an uproar againſt him) was ſtoned by them, who when they underſtood him better, being freed from their *furious paſſions*, yielded him, as his great worth deſerved, an *high and honourable reſpect*. And the influence of this evil temper carried ſo ſtrong a *byaſs* to *pervert* the judgments of the *Donatiſts*, that St. *Auſtin* himſelf was miſreputed by them, as a *ſeducer and deceiver of Souls*; *and they exclaimed againſt him both publickly* *Baſ. Ep.* 75. *Naz. Carm. de Vita ſuâ.* *Poſſidon. de vit. Aug. c.* 9.

lickly and privately, that he was a Wolf, who ſhould be ſlain for the preſervation of the flock. And all this was only becauſe that famous man kept and *defended* the Communion of the Church, which they *rejected*, he truly judging that a duty, which they erroneouſly condemned as a ſin. Thus this uneven glaſs of prejudice, when placed before the minds of men, miſ-repreſenteth even what is comely and amiable, as if it was monſtrous, ugly and deformed.

SECT. II.

Shewing theſe contentions to diſadvantage Chriſtianity, *and to* gratify Popery *and* Irreligion.

1. It is manifeſt that the open appearance of ſuch, and indeed of all other open contentions in the Church, have conſtantly *abated* the honourable *eſteem* of *Chriſtianity* in the World, amongſt them who do not profeſs it; and upon that account they ought as much as is poſſible, to be avoided by thoſe who value the *intereſt of Religion. Clemens* the Fellow-labourer of St. *Paul* took notice, that in the diſſentions fomented at *Corinth*, about no matters of Doctrine, but

Ep. ad Corinth. p. 2.

but only of *Order and Government*, the *hot diſtractions of a few heady and ſelf pleaſing perſons*, (as he ſtileth them) *occaſioned the name of that Church, to be greatly reproached and evil ſpoken of; which was otherwiſe honourable, renowned, and worthy to be loved.* And *Socrates* averreth, that the controverſies (neceſſary on the Churches part) about *Arianiſm* were attended with ſo great a miſchief, that the *Chriſtian profeſſion it ſelf, was from thence openly derided in the Theaters*, even under the Government of a Chriſtian Emperour: and *Conſtantine* himſelf obſerved, that the oppoſition of the *Donatiſts*, at its firſt taking root, did bring forth ſuch dangerous fruit, *that they who had their minds eſtranged from this moſt holy Religion, had thence an occaſion given them to ſcorn and deride it.* And the reflection upon the ſtrange proneneſs to diſagreement among Chriſtians, occaſioned that reproachful expreſſion againſt the Chriſtian name, related of *Solyman* the *Turkiſh Emperour*, who when it was told him, that the *Chriſtians* would *unite* together againſt him at the laſt; he lifting up his hand, and ſtretching out his fingers replyed, That there was no more ground to fear, that the Chriſtians ſhould ever unite, than to fear that thoſe fingers ſhould grow together.

Socr. Hiſt. Eccl. lib. 1. c. 5.

Euſ. Hiſt. Eccl. l. 10. c. 5.

2. Nor is it hard to shew, that such differences among *Protestants*, do gratify the interests and desires, and comply with the designs of the *Papists*. It is the known Maxim of their great *Politician*, *Bella hæreticorum, pax Ecclesiæ*, which in his language expresseth, our discords to be their security: And Bishop *Whitgift* in Queen *Elizabeths* days, expressed it to be a thing *notorious*, that the *opposing Uniformity*, *was in* England *the Papists advantage, and the Protestants disadvantage:* and which way their interests and endeavours at this time move, may be discerned by any observing eye without the help of a *Telescope*, their hopes being founded in our dissentions,

Contz. Polit. l. 2. c. 19.

Letter to the Council in *Fuller's Hist. l. 9.*

Contz. l. 2. c. 18.

3. Upon these dissentions also they much insist, to *dissuade* persons thereby from the *Protestant profession*; though this is indeed no other argument than what the *Gentiles* of old made use of against Christianity, and is both long since sufficiently answered by *Clemens Alexandrinus*, *Origen* against *Celsus*, and many other Fathers on the behalf of *Christians*, and hath lately been well returned upon the Papists themselves. However the *influence* from these divisions is so considerable, though the *argument* from them be not valuable, that *Contzen* relateth it as the

Strom. l. 7.

Polit. lib. 9. c. 21.

the complaint of a Proteſtant Writer of good account, *Papiſtæ funeſtis Evangelicorum diſſidiis abſterrentur à Doctrina Evangelicorum, ceu hæreticâ, Satanicâ & ſeditioſâ; That by the lamentable diſcords of the Proteſtants, the Papiſts are frighted from the Doctrine of the Reformed Churches, as if it was Heretical, Satanical, and Seditious*: and in the ſame place he ſpeaketh his own thoughts. *We*, ſaith he, *can not approve the cauſe of the Proteſtants, which always ſome part of themſelves, and ſometimes the chief and moſt numerous part doth deteſt.*

4. Nor are their endeavours ordinarily wanting, to blow up the *Coals of contention*, that they may be advantaged by the *ſmoak*. That they did animate ſome diſſenters from *Conformity* in the *Queens* days, was aſſerted by Biſhop *Whitgift*, upon his own *certain knowledge*. And that in theſe laſt thirty years and upwards, they were *promoters* of our diviſions, is more than probable from the informations given to the Archbiſhop, 1640. by *Andreas ab Habernsfield* a *Bohemian* of noble deſcent, and from many particular paſſages concerning our late diſcords publiſhed by Mr. *Prinne*, and Monſieur *du Moulin*, together with diverſe credible relations of *known Roman-*

Letter to the Lord Treaſurer in *Fuller*, *ubi ſupra*.

V. Bibliotb. Reg. p. 42.

iſts

iſts in the meetings of diverſe Sects. Mr. *Baxter* long ſince declared, that he began to have a ſtrong ſuſpicion, that the *Papiſts* had indeed an hand in the *extirpation of Epiſcopacy*, and citeth Biſhop *Bramhal*'s words againſt *Meliterius*. *There was a Biſhop in the World* (*loſers may have leave to talk*) *whoſe privy Purſe and ſubtil Councils did help to kindle that unnatural War in his Majeſties three Kingdoms.*

Grot. Relig. Sect. 66.

5. Agreeably hereto it was obſerved their *Policy* about two hundred years ſince, to endeavour to extinguiſh the ſparks of light in the *Bohemian Church* by dividing them aſunder; and as *Comenius* relateth, *admiſcebant ſe perſonati quidam, qui Papæ cauſam promoturi, diſſentiones mutuas promovebant.* And *Bullenger* (as he is cited by Biſhop *Whitgift* in his exhortation before his anſwer to the Admonition) declared, *that the Anabaptiſts in* Switzerland, *and the parts of* Germany, *were animated by the ſubtil Papiſts.*

Comen. Hiſtoriola, Sect. 36.

Bulleng. adv. Anabapt.

6. Yet if any will not ſo much as *ſuſpect*, that theſe ſeeds of diviſion are either ſecretly *ſown*, or *watered* from theſe hands; conſiderate men have found cauſe to conclude, that they expect to *reap* an *harveſt* by them. This hath not only been

been expreſſed by ſome of themſelves, and diſcerned by others in the Churches of *England*, *Bohemia*, and *Switzerland*, but the ſame hath been alſo apprehended in all other Proteſtant Churches. *Hubertus Languetus*, a man of great authority, and at that time the *Duke* of *Saxonies* Embaſſador, reſident in the Emperous Court at *Vienna* (as *Comenius*, who relateth the words of his Epiſtle, declareth) writing to *Andreas Stephanus* a *Bohemian* Biſhop, declareth what his obſervation had diſcovered, almoſt an hundred years ſince; ſaith he, *The Pope feareth nothing more than our conſenting and joining in Unity*;---*ſed ſunt inter nos inſani quidam Theologi, &c. But there are among us ſome furious Divines, who reject all right Counſels, and thereby perform a work advantageous to the Popes intereſt.*

7. And even *Beza* in the life of *Calvin* declareth concerning the controverſies in *Saxony* about *adiaphorous rites*, as the Surplice, *&c.* that *Calvin did at firſt diſlike Ph. Melanchthon*, (who perſwaded to Conformity) *but afterwards he diſcovered that there was no reaſon ſo to do. For at that time it did not appear* (ſaith Beza) *with what ſpirit that evil Genius, and the whole Troop of the Flacians*

ans (who disclaimed Conformity) were hurried on, which afterwards caused so many troubles, and still do hinder the work of God, non aliter sane, nec minus furiose & impudenter, quam si ab ipso Romano Pontifice magnis stipendiis esset conducta: with no less impudence and fury, (saith he) *than if they had been hired by large salaries from the Pope of* Rome. And this contentious spirit of *Flacius Illyricus* (who was in some other respects a man deserving commendation) hath gained him this Character from *Ursin*, that he was one, *qui per complures annos, præstantissimis atque veris Christianis, & Orthodoxis viris obtrectando, & multas non necessarias altercationes excitando, plurimorum conscientias, & passim Ecclesias, in Germania turbavit; Who for divers years, by his discrediting worthy and true Christians and Orthodox men, and by stirring up many unnecessary contentions, was a troubler of divers Consciences and Churches, all over* Germany.

Præf. in Apol. Catech.

8. Nor is it hard to discover, that these dissentions about our publick service, are made an occasion by *some* others (I might say by *many* others) who are more *careless* than scrupulous in matters of Piety, for their *gross neglecting* the worship of God, and the duties of

of Religion: as the diſputes about the Lords Supper, have in ſeveral places apparently cauſed a great careleſneſs of *attending* on that *great Ordinance.* It was Biſhop *Whitgifts* obſervation concerning our former times, that in King *Edwards* time, and the beginning of Queen *Elizabeths*, *before the heat of theſe contentions, the Goſpel mightily prevailed and took great encreaſe, but ſince this ſchiſm and diviſion,* (ſaith he) *the contrary effects have happened.* And indeed no other can be well expected, becauſe thereby is manifeſtly wanting that forcible motive, from the general joining in the ſervice of God with *readineſs of mind*, and with *one conſent*, which might perſwade them who are otherwiſe careleſs of Religion, to be more ſerious, by making them *aſhamed* of their negligence. Letter to the Council, *ubi ſupra.*

9. And *doubtfulneſs* of Religion in ſome, and *profaneneſs* of life in others, are the woful ordinary conſequents of ſuch differences. When the *Donatiſts*, who neither erred in the Faith, nor appeared vitious in their lives, made a *great breach* in the Church, about matters of *diſcipline*; *Optatus* noteth, that while they contended that their ſeparation was *lawful*, and the Orthodox Church decryed it as *unlawful*, the common people *Opt. adv. Parm. l. 5.*

were

were doubtful, and at a ſtand in the practice of Religion. *Inter veſtrum Licet & noſtrum Non licet, nutant & remigant animæ populorum.* And that Apoſtolical man *Clemens*, expreſſeth the fruits of the diviſions in the *Corinthian Church*, about their Governours, to be theſe: τὸ σχίσμα ὑμῶν πολλὰς διέστρεψεν, *your diviſion hath perverted and turned aſide many*; πολλοὺς εἰς ἀθυμίαν ἔβαλεν, *it hath diſcouraged many and made them deſpond*; πολλοὺς εἰς διγνωμὸν, τὰς πάντας ὑμᾶς εἰς λύπην, *it bringeth many into doubtfulneſs, and us all to grief and ſorrow.*

Ep. ad Cor. p. 61.

10. And beſides *divers other ways* mentioned in the following Sections, whereby *Religion* is *diſadvantaged* by theſe oppoſitions; it is upon this account alſo apparently hindred, becauſe theſe *diſcords* do oft *divert* many Miniſters, from the more directly profitable parts of their employment; and make it neceſſary for them to ſpend much time, in *ſatisfying* theſe *ſcruples*, and anſwering objections, with thoughtfulneſs of the *ill conſequence* of theſe *diſſentions*; while they have other work enough to do in the *worſhip of God*, the *edifying his Church*, and the *oppoſing* other *deſigns* of thoſe Enemies who ſeek to undermine it. This is like the diſcovery of a fire breaking forth, or inward

inward mutinies appearing at that time, when there is much neceſſary work to be done at home, and many conflicts to be prepared for both at home and abroad; which muſt needs put ſome conſiderable obſtructions to thoſe proceedings.

SECT. III.

Of the dangerous loſs of the Churches Peace and Unity *by this controverſie, and of the ſin of* Schiſm.

1. That upon matters referring to this controverſie, the *Peace and Concord* of our Church doth much depend, and that it is and hath been thereby evidently and extreamly hindred, is ſo apparently viſible that it needeth no proof, and hath been on all hands generally confeſſed and complained of. Now though it be every Chriſtians duty, to *reject* that *Peace* which is inconſiſtent with *Piety*, yet there can be no diſcharge given to theſe great duties of *Peace and Unity*, where they may be practiſed conſiſtently with *godlineſs and truth*. To be truly Religious, is to enjoy a healthful ſtate of a ſound mind, where there is no lethargick ſtupidneſs, but an inward and vigorous life, which is not attended with diſtempered heats and

and inflammation, but with a calm and ſedate compoſure of a ſober ſpirit; for *the fruits of righteouſneſs are ſown in peace*, Jam. 3. 18.

2. This *duty* is ſo *conſiderable*, that the Holy Ghoſt ſeemeth ſcarce in any thing elſe, ſo pathetically to command and urge our practical obedience, as about the *Churches Peace*, and *Chriſtian Unity*. Phil. 2. 1, 2. *If there be any conſolation in Chriſt*, (ſaith the Apoſtle) *if any comfort of love, if any fellowſhip of the Spirit, if any bowels and mercies: fulfil ye my joy, that ye be like minded, being of one accord, and of one mind.* Yea, ſo generally is this duty preſſed, that there is ſcarce any Book of the holy Scripture, chiefly of the *New Teſtament*, but doth particularly enjoin or recommend it.

3. If we value the *favour* and *preſence of God*, even that is no where ſo much to be found, as where Chriſtian Peace and Unity are moſt purſued. Wherefore St. *Paul* commandeth, 2 *Cor.* 13. 11. *Be of one mind, live in peace, and the God of love and peace ſhall be with you.* And the ſame Apoſtle declareth, that the Eph. 2. 21, 22. Church *becometh an Holy Temple, and an habitation of God*, by being a *building joined and united in Chriſt, and fitly framed together*, συναρμολογουμένη (and ſome have

have not amiſs obſerved, that in the framing of that Greek word, there is contained a treble band of Unity.) The Jewiſh Doctors obſerved, that the *Shecinah* or Divine preſence did dwell with the הענוים the *meek and quiet* ſpirits, but flyeth from the הכעסנים them who were wrathful and angry. *Nazianzen* maketh it a conſiderable Character of one who is θεῷ καὶ θείων ἐγγὺς, *near to God and to what is Divine, that he is a man who embraceth peace, and hateth diſcord*: and *Ignatius* expreſſeth the great profitableneſs of being ἐν ἀμώμῳ ἑνότητι *in unſpotted Unity, that thereby they may always have Communion with God, and prevail againſt the power of the Devil.*

Nazianz. Orat. 14.

Ign. Ep. ad Eph. p. 20. & 25. Edit. Voſſ.

4. If the true *exerciſe* of the *Chriſtian life* and *duty* be conſidered, St. *Paul* declareth the diviſions and diſcords of the Church of *Corinth*, to be an evidence that they were *carnal*, 1 *Cor.* 3. 3. and to be the cauſe why their aſſembling to the Lords Supper, was not *advantageous*, but *hurtful* to them, *Ch.* 11. 17, 18. and that the benefits of true *Chriſtian growth* and *encreaſe* are to be expected in *Chriſtian Unity*, *Eph.* 4. 16. *Ch.* 2. 21. *Col.* 2. 19. And in thoſe words of our departing Saviour, *Joh.* 14. 27. *Peace I leave with you, my peace I give unto you*, the ancient

Fathers have conceived, the great *bleſſing of peace* given by Chriſt to his Church, and the *duty of peace* required in it to be chiefly contained. To this ſenſe, St. *Cyprian*, *Hilary*, *Baſil*, *Ambroſe*, *Chryſoſtome*, and *Theophylact* expound that place, (ſome of them including alſo the tranquillity of the Chriſtian mind, and the perfect peace of the life to come.) And from that Text St. *Auguſtine* concludeth, that he *cannot come to Gods inheritance, who doth not obſerve Chriſts Teſtament*; *and he can have no concord with Chriſt, who will be at diſcord with a Chriſtian.*

Cyp. de Unit. Eccl.
Hil. in Pſ. 119.
Baſil. Mor. Reg. 50.
Amb. de Joſeph. c. 13.
Serm. 59. *de Verb. Dom.*

5. That the *want of peace* becometh the *decay of Piety*, may be alſo ſufficiently confirmed by particular inſtances. *Clemens* obſerved concerning the *Corinthian* Church, that *while they enjoyed peace, they had an unſatiable deſire to do good, & received a plentiful effuſion of the holy Spirit, they were religious in their ſupplications to God, and harmleſs towards one another: but upon their diſcord, righteouſneſs, and peace was baniſhed far from them, they all* (who embraced diviſions) *forſook the fear of God, and became darkſighted in the Faith, and walked after evil affections.* And *Nazianzen* took notice, that Religion had once flouriſhed in the Church, and calculating the ſeaſon when its

Ep. ad Cor. p. 3.
P. 5.

its *decay* began, he ſaith, ἀφ' ἧς ἡ ἀντίθεος γλῶσσα, &c. *that from the time this contradicting ſpirit as a terrible Diſeaſe infected the Church, thence forward its beauty and glory did decline.* And there is *another Country* not unknown to us, where like effects may be obſerved; and after *peace* was loſt, *injuſtice* and *unrighteouſneſs*, like a mighty torrent, did at once bear down all before it; *heretical blaſphemies* were frequently belched forth, againſt all the *fundamental Articles* of the Chriſtian Faith; and *all manner* of *vile affections* were profeſſedly ſerved, under the *ranting* and other names, of pretendedly *Religious Sects.* Naz. Orat. 21.

6. Upon this account Chriſtian peace was deſervedly *eſteemed*, and *honoured* in the Primitive Church: to which purpoſe, the judgment and practice of that excellent ſpirited man, *Gr. Nazianzen*, is above others worthy our obſervation. He *diſſwadeth* from that peace which is evil and ſinful, but by no means alloweth any *diſcharge* to this great duty in other caſes: and declareth that his little Church, where he was Biſhop before he went to *Conſtantinople*, continuing in Unity and concord, when diſcord had much overſpread the Chriſtian World, was *reputed to be as the Ark of* Noah, *which alone e-* Orat. 12.

ſcaped the univerſal deluge, and where Religion was intirely preſerved. And that good man (as both *Ruffinus* and himſelf relate) when the Church was like to be embroiled upon his account; *cryed out in the words of* Jonah; *If this tempeſt be for me, take me up and caſt me into the Sea, and the diſturbance ſhall be at an end.* And his readineſs by all effectual means to promote Peace, together with his eloquent diſcourſes to that purpoſe, had ſuch an influence upon the concord of the ſecond *General Council*, and the Churches good, that *Baronius* thinketh, that thereupon the very place where that Council ſate, and theſe ſpeeches were made, did bear the name of *Concordia* in after times, which was an evidence how highly *Concord* was then valued. Indeed it becometh a builder to repair and cement the breaches in the Church, which is the Houſe of God; but he who would widen and encreaſe them, goeth the way to make the whole to fall, and it may be that part may be firſt in its ruins which he leaſt deſireth.

Ruff. Prol. in Naz. Orat. 49.

Naz. carm. de Vit. ſua.

Baron. Annal. An. 381. *n.* 55.

7. Beſides this, the dreadful *ruines* of *Kingdoms and Countries*, which are ſometimes the conſequents of *Church diviſions*, are enough to awaken and deeply affect them, who are not ſenſeleſs and paſt feeling,

feeling, to beware thereof. He who readeth the *Hiſtory of the Turks*, and of the *Eaſtern Empire*, may ſee that the Chriſtians *State diviſions*, founded upon, or fomented by *diſcords in the Church*, laid the foundation on which the Turks erected their Dominion in thoſe places; which was the *rooting out* their publick *Chriſtian profeſſion*. And the laſt words of the *Old Teſtament* acquaint us, that the continuance of diſſentions provoketh God to *ſmite the Earth with a Cherem*, or a dreadful Curſe which includeth an irrecoverable devoting: and *Joſephus* relateth that the *diviſions of Jeruſalem* and the Jewiſh Nation, expoſed them to the deſolation brought upon them by the Romans, αὐλὼν στάσις οἰκεῖα καθῆλε. And it is obſerved by *Baronius*, that the *diſſentions in Africa* raiſed by the *Donatiſts*, were the occaſion of the great calamities there ſuſtained; firſt from the *Vandals*, and after that from the *Arabians*; to the deſtruction of the Country, and the almoſt *final ruine* there, both of the *other Chriſtians*, and of the *Donatiſts* themſelves.

Prol. de Bel. Jud.

Bar. An. 303. *n.* 29.

8. Amongſt plenty of other inſtances, it becometh us to be moſt affected, as we were moſt concerned, with the much *Chriſtian bloud, unchriſtianly ſhed* in *England*, as a ſad conſequence of theſe conten-

tions. We made our selves an example to *Foreigners*, who took notice that *Apud Anglos, integro seculo de Ecclesiæ regimine controversia violenter agitata est, ad status usq; publici convulsionem*; *that the violent motions and disturbances in* England *about Ecclesiastical controversies, wrought us into a convulsive and distracted State.* And *we* who are *neareſt home*, ought to be, it we be not, most sensible and apprehensive of this, which *others at a distance* could not but observe with some *amazement.* The Lord grant that we may at length learn to mind the ways of Peace, and discern the danger and guilt of needless running into divisions.

9. The breaking the Churches Peace is *peculiarly sinful*, when without any just and necessary grounds, contentions run so high, as to appear in *open Schism* and *separation*, which hath been long designed, and is too much practised by many opposers of Conformity. And though it be and must be asserted, that *separation* is both *lawful and necessary*, and therefore free from the sin of *Schism*, where Communion, upon a right understanding, cannot be kept without sin; yet even the Writings of many *Non-conformists* as well as of others, do express and aggravate the sin of *unnecessary separation*, and the *Ca-*

nons

nons of the *ancient Church* declare very severely against it. Besides *Conc. Ancyr. c.* 18. *Gang. c.* 6. *Antioch. c.* 5. 2 *Carth. c.* 9. *Trull. c.* 31. Such separation is condemned as *ambition and tyranny*, in the Canons called the Apostles; as *a destructive Sacrilegious sin*, in the *African Code*; as a *sin which excludeth from the Kingdom of Heaven*, by *Ignatius*; and it is censured to include *a contempt of true Religion*, by the Helvetick confession.

Can. Ap. 31. *Conc. Carth. Gr. c.* 100.

Ign. ad Philad. Conf. Helv. c. 22.

10. It is a known and approved sentence of *Dionysius Alexandrinus*, That *to suffer Martyrdom* ἕνεκεν τοῦ μὴ σχίσαι *rather than to divide the Church by Schism, is not less glorious than to be a Martyr for refusing to offer Sacrifice unto Idols.* And S. *Cyprian* asserteth that the sin of *breaking the Churches peace by Schism, is in divers respects more hainous than the sin of those lapsed Christians, who in the time of persecution, yielded to offer Sacrifice to Idols.* Because the latter *bewailed* his miscarriage, and by *repentance sought for pardon from God*, and communion with his Church, his *straights and dangers* were the occasion of his sin, and though he miscarried himself, he *did not perswade others* to do the like, and he might afterwards be honoured as a *Martyr*: whereas the former was swelling and pleasing him-

Eus. Eccl. Hist. l. 6. *c.* με.

Cyp. de Unit. Eccles.

ſelf in his ſin, did diſturb, oppoſe, and reject the Church, his ſin was of his own free and voluntary choice, and he alſo beguiled and enſnared others. And all this was expreſſed by both theſe ancient Writers with peculiar reference to the *Novatian Schiſm*, which then made a breach in the *Churches Unity*, about matters of *Diſcipline* without denying any Articles of the Faith. And S. *Cyprian* proceedeth ſo far, as to declare, *That if the man who ſoweth diſcord in the Church, ſhould lay down his life in the defence of the name of Chriſt, the ſtain of his ſin could not be wiped out* (that is ſo as to render him honoured in the Church) *by the ſtream of his bloud*; but as he goeth on, *inexpiabilis & gravis eſt culpa diſcordiæ, nec paſſione purgatur.* And the ſame thing is by *Optatus* urged againſt the *Donatiſts*, and is approved by divers others; as being grounded on the words of S. *Paul*, *If I give my body to be burned, and have not Charity, it profiteth me nothing.* And from hence we may diſcern, that in thoſe Primitive times, when the vital heat of Piety within was able to prevail againſt the fierceſt flames of Perſecution without, this duty of minding the Churches Unity, had a mighty commanding force upon the Conſciences of Chriſtians, and they

Ibidem.

Opt. adv. Parm. l. 3.

they accounted *unneceſſary diviſions* and *Schiſms*, to be unchriſtian practices and dreadful ſins.

11. Nor can ſuch *ſeparation* be otherwiſe accounted of than a great evil, which general experience manifeſteth, ordinarily to eat out *Chriſtian love*; and doth moſt directly and openly oppoſe that *Chriſtian Unity*, which (as the following Section will evidence) the *Goſpel Commandeth*, the relation of *Memberſhip* in the Chriſtian Society *requireth*, and our bleſſed *Saviour* earneſtly and affectionately *recommended*; and hath naturally ſuch other dangerous attendants, as have been above obſerved to be the reſult of the breach, or want of the Churches Peace. This ſin is to the Church what *Sedition* is to the *State*, the moſt manifeſt and direct means to hinder its *Government*, and to deſtroy that *Society* which is beſt preſerved in true *Unity*; and of which as Chriſt himſelf hath, ſo every Chriſtian ought to have a tender regard. It is to the body of Chriſt what *disjointing* is to the body of man; it hindreth the actions of the body, and the uſefulneſs of the members to each other; it weakneth the whole, and cauſeth pain and anxious grief to thoſe other members which are not ſenſeleſs, and is ordinarily accompanied with

with *ſwelling tumours* in the part ill-affected, and out of order.

12. And as it ſelf is contrary to Gods Commandment, ſo its influence promoteth all manner of ſin, and is called by *Ignatius* ἀρχὴ κακῶν *an original of evils.* For beſides the evils above mentioned which accompany this ſin, as it includeth a breach of the Churches Peace; it is apt to prevail with the Separatiſts to *ſo much impiety*, as to place much of his Religion in that which is his ſin; *viz.* his unwarrantable ſeparation; and it is oft, if not ordinarily, attended with ſo great *uncharitableneſs*, as to be pleaſed (with reſpect to the intereſt of their party) in hearing, if not ſpeaking evil, concerning others who withſtand them. It *promoteth profaneneſs* and *diſadvantageth Religion* in others, by rendring cenſures and admonitions of the Church, when they are adminiſtred, the leſs efficacious upon the offenders; who are the more ready to conclude, that it is no great ſhame or danger, to be excluded from that Society of Chriſtians, from which many who profeſs Religion do exclude themſelves. And upon this and other *eaſily diſcernable accounts*, it is a probable occaſion of *remiſneſs* in the exerciſing *diſcipline*, which would be more enforced and inlivened

Ign. Ep. ad Smyr.

livened by a more general Union; whereby alſo divers obſtacles and impediments would be removed. Thus *Athanaſius* was of opinion, *that the Corinthian diviſions were the cauſe, why the inceſtuous perſon was not rejected.* *Athan. Synopſ. in 1. Ep. ad Cor.*

SECT. IV.

Some falſe Conceptions of Schiſm *refuted.*

1. But becauſe there are ſome notions or rather miſrepreſentations of this ſin of *Schiſm*, deſigned to excuſe many from the guilt thereof, whom the *rules of Chriſtianity* do involve under it, I ſhall endeavour to diſcover the inſufficiency of ſuch Plaiſters, either to cover or cure ſo great and dangerous wounds, as the *deep rents* made in the Church, to which they are applyed.

2. A *firſt* falſe Conception of *Schiſm*, is the natural reſult of the *New-England Independent* Principles of *Church-Communion.* They aſſert expreſly, that *Baptiſm* neither maketh nor admitteth any to be members of the Church; and call it the opinion of *Papiſts* and *Anabaptiſts* that we enter into the Church by *Baptiſm.* But they aſſert the foundation of Church-Society A firſt Notion. *Anſ. to 32. Qu. qu. 4.*

Society to be laid in their *Church-Covenant*, which is a particular contract among themſelves, binding themſelves to God and one to another, to live in Chriſtian Society with that *particular Congregation*, to which they join themſelves by this contract. And this Church-Covenant is, they ſay, *the Conſtitutive form of a Church*, and joining in it is that which *maketh a particular perſon a member of a Church*. And from hence it may be eaſily inferred, that there can be no *duty* of *holding*, and therefore no ſin of *Schiſm* in *withdrawing*, or *neglecting* Communion, where they have not made this engagement by that particular Covenant.

Apol. for Chur. Covn. p. 3,5. 15.

3. But this notion of the *Union* and *Communion of the Church*, doth confine it to ſuch ſtrait limits, as to exclude in a manner all Chriſtians of all ages from Church Society, but themſelves; and is thereby uncharitable and no ſtranger to Schiſm, and can not conſiſt with the full and due ſenſe of the *Churches Catholiciſm*: for the ancient Church did never account the obligation to Chriſtian Communion, to be ſo narrow a thing, as only to reſpect a *particular Congregation*, and therefore never framed any ſuch *particular Covenant*. This is alſo directly contrary to S. *Paul*, who as an argument to Union and againſt

againſt Schiſm, ſaith 1 *Cor.* 12. 13. *By one Spirit we are all baptized into one body*: and teacheth us that *we are baptized into Chriſt*, Rom. 3. 6. and thereby are *planted together in the likeneſs of his death*, v. 5. and that they *who are baptized into Chriſt, do put on Chriſt*, Gal. 3. 27. Which Scriptures do ſufficiently expreſs, that by our Baptiſm as we undertake the *Chriſtian life*, ſo we thereby are admitted to be *members* of the Church or body of Chriſt, and are engaged as members to *Unity* therein, and to continue in *Communion* therewith. Whereas if this notion was admitted, the grounds *for the being and Union* of the Church, which the Scriptures lay down, together with the Apoſtolical and Primitive practice, muſt be accounted as inſufficient, and the neceſſary ſupport of its being and Union, muſt be derived from this *late invention*. All which things are ſufficient to manifeſt the errour of this opinion, and to ſhew that there may be a ſinful breach of the *Unity of the Church*, among them who never *entred* into that *Church Covenant*.

A ſecond Notion. Dr. *Own* of Love & Church Peace. *c.* 3.

4. But one of that way of our own Nation, treating of *Schiſm* and *ſeparation*, acknowledgeth Baptiſm to give *Relation to or entrance into the Catholick Church viſible*; but ſtill owneth a particular contract

tract or joint consent among themselves, to be the only bond for external Ecclesiastical Communion in a particular Church, or (as he expresseth it) *to be that wherein the Union of such a Church doth consist* (which will be hereafter further considered.) And he giveth us this representation of Schism, That the sin of Schism doth not consist in the want of, or breach of *external Unity* by separation, but in the want of *internal Unity* by *needless divisions of judgment* in a particular Congregation, as σχισμα (he saith) is used 1 *Cor. c.* 1. 11. Hence these assertions are laid down. 1. *That the departing of any man or men from any particular Church, as to the Communion peculiar to such a Church is nowhere* (in Scripture) *called Schism, nor is so in the nature of the thing it self.* 2. *One Church refusing to hold that Communion with another which ought to be between them, is not Schism properly so called.*

N. 19, 20. Dr. *Owen's* Review of Schism, *ch.* 8, 9.

5. But if we here consider the *matter* or thing it self we must enquire whether Christian Religion doth allow *needless separations* in the Christian Church. And surely he must have strange thoughts of the *earnest commands* and *frequent arguments* for Christian Unity, who supposeth them to regard only an *inward Unity*, and

and yet to allow of *open breaking* and *dividing*, and *visible falling* into *pieces*. Is this to think either honourably or reasonably of the designs of Christ, to suppose that he should express his Church to be *one body compacted* and joined together, *Eph.* 4. 16. intending that its real members might be daily parting asunder by *disclaiming* the *Communion* of each other? or that the whole Church should be as *one building fitly framed together*, *Eph.* 2. 21. but with free allowance, that its parts should be at such a manifest distance, as never to come so near one another as to owne their communion? And when our Saviour prayed for his Church, which should believe through his Apostles Doctrine, as a consequent upon their believing, *that they may be one in us that the world may believe that thou hast sent me*, Joh. 17. 20, 21. it is manifest that that Union of the Church, which should tend to convince the World of Christianity, and engage them to the Faith of Christ, must, besides the *inward Unity of Faith and love*, include an *open and professed* holding *communion* with each other; which is the most visible testimony of their Unity, and the want of which hath occasioned them who were strangers to Christianity, to decry and loath

Cyp. de Orat. Dom. *Chrysost. in Joh.* 17. *Hom.* 81. Οὐδὲν οὕτως σκανδαλίζει ἅπαντας ὡς τὸ διϊ σπᾶσθαι.

loath the Christian Religion, as appeareth from what is above-mentioned in the second Section. And when S. *Paul* requireth to *keep the Unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace*, it hath been reasonably of old thence inferred, that *separation and breaking the Churches peace, ought to be rejected*, because it *opposeth and loseth that Unity of the Spirit, which Christians should maintain, by renouncing fellowship with the Church of Christ.*

Hier. in Eph. 4.

Cypr. Ep. 52.

6. And it is manifest that *needless withdrawing* or not holding communion, with that *particular settled Church* where we abide, with appearance of causeless distaste towards it, or the way of its communion, was vehemently and with a pathetick zeal condemned in S. *Peter* himself, withdrawing and separating from the *Gentiles*; which action included a *blameable forbearance*, of manifesting his allowance and approbation, of their way of *Christian life* and *serving God*. Gal. 2. 11. 14. And the manifold cautions against *divisions* oft expressed in the Scriptures, do especially condemn such separation, which is the highest attempt, and most *open profession of dividing*: and as this separation is expressly condemned in the holy Scripture, so this is that thing which is so greatly condemned by the *ancient*

Canons

Canons above named, and that even under the term and name of *Schiſm*. And it is of no ſmall moment to obſerve, that the *Primitive Church*, who received the holy Commandments of the Goſpel from the *Apoſtles*, did always underſtand the *precepts of peace*, to extend mainly to the duties of external *communion*; eſpecially conſidering, that whereas the *Churches peace* can only be broken by *Church conteſts*, which are managed either by words, writings, or open actions of diſcord, this latter way of expreſſing them by *actions of ſeparation*, and open *rendezvous* of parties, is of all other the higheſt and moſt conſiderable.

7. But if the uſe of the word (*Schiſm*) be here conſidered, it includeth much of *needleſs ſtrife* about words, to deny χίσμα or *Schiſm*, ſignifying *diviſion or renting aſunder*, to be a fit expreſſion for rents and ſeparations in the Church; when it hath been ſo uſed in the common *Eccleſiaſtical cuſtom* of ſpeech, and is that which is according to the direct and *proper import* of the word. And if S. *Paul* accounted the bandying into parties and factions at *Corinth*, though *without ſeparation* (which ſome account to be their caſe) to be *Schiſms*, becauſe their Unity was thereby oppoſed and hindred; much

more muſt *ſeparation* which is the higheſt appearance of parties, and breach of Unity, (and was probably the true ſtate at *Corinth*) be ſo accounted of.

Dr. *Owen* of Evang. Love and Church Peace, c. 5.

8. And whereas the ſame perſon hath of late purpoſely undertaken to eſpouſe the *intereſt of ſeparation* from the preſent *Church of England*, and to defend it from the charge of *Schiſm*, the pleas and pretences made in behalf thereof, will now fall under our enquiry.

A third Notion. Its firſt Plea.

P. 167, 171, 172.

9. One principal plea is, *That where things or obſervances unſcriptural, are made the indiſpenſible condition of Communion, there to refuſe ſubmiſſion to ſuch things impoſed, and to with-hold Communion from that Church, is no Schiſm but a diſcharge of a duty.* And that we may underſtand what he meaneth by ſuch expreſſions, as *Unſcriptural conditions of Communion*; he

P. 171. telleth us in one place, *We do not diſpute the lawfulneſs or unlawfulneſs of the things*

P. 177. *themſelves*; and in another place, *that it may be at preſent granted, that the manner or modes of the performance of Gods worſhip, with rites and ceremonies for order and decency, may be lawfully appointed* (or as it pleaſed him to call it *inſtituted*) *by the rulers of the Church*; *yet* (ſaith he) *this will not help in our preſent enquiry, unleſs it be alſo granted,* that *what may be lawfully*

lawfully practiſed in the worſhip of God, may be alſo lawfully made a neceſſary condition of Communion. And he ſaith in another place, *It is required in this caſe,* P. 205. *not only to produce a warranty from the Scripture for the uſe of Liturgies, but alſo for making the conſtant attendance on them, a neceſſary condition of Communion.* Wherefore his ſenſe is, that with-holding Communion becometh lawful and a duty, where any *appointments*, for orderly miniſtration, and the fit and decent performance of Gods ſervice, (though lawful in themſelves, but not particularly expreſſed in Scripture as *conditions of Communion*) are ſo determined, that they muſt be *ſubmitted to* and *complyed* with, by them who embrace actual Communion with that particular Church.

10. But this is both falſe in it ſelf, and would render all ſettled Church-Communion utterly *Unlawful*, and would make ſeparation the Univerſal duty of all Chriſtians, in every *Chriſtian Aſſembly* in the World, not excepting them of the Congregational way. For the Scriptures have not injoined the *particular time* for Sacramental and other adminiſtrations, nor the *place for publick Aſſemblies*, nor in *what method*, Prayer, Preaching, Sacraments, Pſalms, Chapters, Hymns, with

other thanksgivings and serviees are to be performed; nor hath it determined us, either to, or against any *particular lawful form*, or *external rite*, as making them either universally necessary, or sinful; but these with divers other things of like nature, are left to the rules of *Ecclesiastical Liberty* and Prudence. Now it concerneth him who made this exception, to discover how there can possibly be any *orderly Christian Assemblies*, and unconfused performances of Religious services, where such things as these are not determined; as where their Prayers and Services, are neither performed with nor without a *form*, *&c.* And to the common apprehensions of other men it is very manifest, that unless there be a *complyance* of *submission* to such determinations, by the members of the Church, they can not actually communicate in these administrations, unless they could *communicate* in what they will not *yield to joyn in.* Yet these things with us are not made the *conditions of communion*, any other way than the submission to lawful determinations (of those things which must be one way or other determined) is necessary for them who will join in such an *orderly Society.*

11. And they who urge this *objection*

do

do themſelves make their determinations of theſe things (beſides ſome other things peculiar to their way) as much a condition of *Communion* in their *Congregations*, as our determinations are with us. They may poſſibly ſtamp a *divine authority* upon thoſe uſages of their own, which really have it not; and urge ſuch things for laws of God which he hath not eſtabliſhed: but this being much of the ſame nature, with *teaching for doctrines the commandments of men*, can never render their communion the more acceptable. And I ſuppoſe this following diſcourſe will ſufficiently manifeſt, that the divine authority doth neither *enjoin* their way of ſervice without all forms and other rites, nor *diſapprove* of ours. And now the *arguments* brought in that Treatiſe to make good this exception, will concern themſelves to anſwer as well as others, and may be eaſily ſolved. For 1. When Chriſt gave Commiſſion to his Apoſtles *to baptize all Nations and teach them to obſerve whatſoever he commanded*; he thereby enjoined all his doctrines and precepts to be received and obeyed of all men, and eſpecially of thoſe who imbrace the *Chriſtian Baptiſm*; but he doth not thereby forbid rules of *decency and order*, which are re- P. 173.

quired in the Scripture, to be received in the Communion of Christians. And 2. the *Apostles practice* and 3. *their doctrine* (with a particular consideration of the fourteenth Chapter to the *Romans*) will be evidenced in this Treatise, to give both allowance and direction for Ecclesiastical constitutions of order.

Lib. 2. Ch. 1. Sect. 3. & Ch. 2. Sect. 2, 3.

12. The *fourth argument* is from this instance of fact. *When* Victor *Bishop of* Rome *excommunicated the* Asian *Churches, for not observing* Easter *at the same time with the* Roman *Church, this his action as fixing new bounds to Church-Communion, was then disliked much by others, and especially rebuked by one of the most holy and learned men then living,* (which was *Irenæus.*) *Ans.* Well might *Victors* actions be censured by *Irenæus*, which was not only a directing and retaining that as a fixed rule of order for his own Church, which was then the *Roman* Custom and practice, and which *Irenæus* and the *French Churches* (as well as many others) did allow and judge requisite, in that very Epistle to *Victor:* but it was the obtruding that which was no Apostolical command or institution, to be so far *Apostolical*, as to be thereupon a doctrine and practice, necessary to be received in all parts of the Christian Church, and that

P. 191.

Euſ. Eccleſ. Hiſt. l. 5. c. 25.

all

all other *whole Churches* who received it not, were not to be owned in the Communion of the Catholick Church: and upon this account he undertook to excommunicate the *Asian* Churches ὡς ἑτεροδοξίσας, *as being Heterodox or erring from the Faith.* But our Church can be charged with no such practices as these were, for it declareth it self thus; *In these our doings we condemn no other Nations, nor prescribe any thing but to our own people only:* which words with other to the same purpose, are prefixed to our Liturgy. His fifth argument is, *that hence it would follow, that there is no certain rule of Communion amongst Christians, fixed and determined by Christ.* To which I answer, that in all *doctrines* of Christianity nothing can be required as necessary for Communion with any Church, but what Christ hath determined: yet even here every errour in judgment or miscarriage in practice, doth not forfeit the right of Communion; and concerning defaults, they who have *the power of the Keys* which is managed with Ecclesiastical Prudence, are allowed to consider of times and other circumstances: whence the Church of God hath *unblameably* used sometimes greater and other times less severity about the same crimes. But that there

Ibid. c. xi.

B. of Com. Prayer of Ceremonies.

P. 194.

Albasp. Observat. l. 2. *Obs.* 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18.

should be *different prudential rules* of external order, in the communion of different Churches, hath generally been allowed and acknowlegded in the *ancient Church*, and pleaded for amongst the *reformed Churches*.

171. 13. Indeed it is in the same Treatise urged, (as a thing included under this exception of *Unscriptural conditions of Communion*) that Ministers are required *to express their approbation of the things injoined*; (as the Liturgy, Articles, and Book of Ordination) *by their subscription or declaration*. But besides, that these things are not intended for *conditions of Christian communion*, but requisite for *regular administrations*, and the preservation of order: it is but reasonable, that they who insist on this Plea, before they *blame* us, much more before they *separate* from us upon this account, should themselves consider whether they would be willing to receive any persons to be Ministers of their Congregations, who do not some way or other *express* their *allowance* of their way and order: and particularly whether they would entertain him as their Minister, who is resolved to *perform* all *ministerial actions* according to the order of the *Liturgy*. If they be willing to entertain such a *Minister* and *Ministration*,

Miniſtration, they muſt thereby juſtifie our way of order and communion, by their ſubmitting to the ſame terms of *injoying Church-Communion*. But if they will admit no perſon to be a Miniſter in their Churches, (as indeed they will not) before they are ſatisfied that he approveth, and will continue in the way and *order of their Churches*; while they herein blame our Church, they ſhould conſider thoſe words of the Apoſtle, *Rom.* 1. 2. *Thou art inexcuſable, O man, whoſoever thou art that judgeſt, for wherein thou judgeſt another thou condemneſt thyſelf, for thou that judgeſt doſt the ſame things.*

14. But of the *lawfulneſs* of things as *enjoined* in the Church for order ſake, which is the main thing conſiderable in this exception, and which hath been divers times ſufficiently juſtified, by Biſhop *Whitgift*, Mr. *Hooker*, and many others ſince them, I ſhall treat in another place more particularly; and it will be ſufficient here to add, that God who hath appointed Rulers in his Church to guide and command, hath alſo made it a duty *to obey them who have the rule over us.*

Biſhop Whitgift Tr. 2. Eccleſ. Polit. l. 3. Lib. 2. c. 2.

15. Another Plea for ſeparation from the Church of *England*, is, *That the joining in communion therewith, requireth a conſent to omit and refuſe known duties commanded*

Its ſecond Plea.

P. 216. P. 218. 231. *commanded by Christ.* For the proof of which, he giveth two instances. In his first instance he claimeth to *every Minister of a particular Congregation, by the appointment of Jesus Christ, the whole immediate care of the flock*, so that *no part of discipline should be exempted from his office, or care* (p. 219.) and this he saith *by Conformity they must renounce* (p. 229.) Which Plea for separation or rejecting Communion, is as much as to say, that no Minister may lawfully communicate and exercise his Ministry in any Church, where this kind of *Congregational Independency* is not the fixed Government; or where the Episcopal power and Authority above *Presbyters* in all or any publick acts of discipline, is preserved. An assertion which savours of great *rashness*, in rejecting all those manifest evidences produced by divers, on the behalf of this Episcopal Government and Jurisdiction, with such an *height of confidence*, as professedly to disclaim the lawfulness of Ecclesiastical Ministration and Communion, with those who in practice embrace them. Yea this is such a position as would have *engaged* all Christian Ministers, to have renounced the Communion of all the *ancient Churches* in the Christian World, in the times of the most eminent

eminent Fathers of the Church, by this new way and method of the *Churches Peace* and Unity. And therefore inſtead of a charge againſt our Church, he hath herein done it this *honour*, to mention that as a chief matter of *exception* againſt it, in which it is *conformable* to the pureſt ages of Chriſtianity.

16. The Councils of *Nice* and *Antioch* (which are part of the Code of the Univerſal Church) expreſſing a manifeſt diſtinction between Biſhops and Presbyters, do declare the diſciplinary proceedings of Church cenſures to be under the *Biſhops ordering* and *authority*; and before them S. *Cyprian* did the ſame, both concerning excommunication and publick diſciplinary abſolution; and *Ignatius* frequently required that nothing ſhould be done without the *Biſhops authority*: to which agree the Scripture expreſſions concerning *Timothy*, *Titus*, and *the Apocalyptick Angels*. And that the ancient *Churches* and the authority of their *Biſhops* were not confined to ſingle *Congregations* (as ſome would have us believe) is apparent, beſides the inſtances from the *Roman* and other Churches in Scripture, 1. From the frequent mention of *Country-Presbyters* and Religious Aſſemblies, in ſuch places for which no Biſhops

Conc. Nic. c. 5. *Conc. Ant. c. 6.* *Cyp. Ep. 10, 65.*

1. *Conc. Neoc. c. 13.* *Conc. Ant. c. 8.* *Conc. Sard. c. 6.* *Athanaſ. Apol.*

Bishops were appointed. 2. From the multitude of Presbyters in one City; it not being credible that 46. *Presbyters* for the City of *Rome* in *Cornelius* his time, 60. at *Constantinople*, (with a greater number both before and after *Justinians* Constitution) and a numerous Company in other Churches, should be designed, with a Bishop and many Deacons for the service of God in a single Congregation.

2. *Euſ. Hiſt. Eccl. l. 6. c. ult. Photii Nomocan. Tit. 1. c. 30. Juſtin. Novel. Conſt.* 3.

3. Because the greatest Cities in the World with the parts adjacent, when Christians were most numerous, had but *one regular Bishop:* and he who can imagine that in the most flourishing times of Christianity, there were never more Christians in those Precincts, than made up a *single Congregation*, (though divers Churches were built at *Jerusalem* and other places) may as well conceive the same of the *present London Dioceſs*. And though there be some expressions in some ancient Writers, as *Tertullian*, and S. *Hierome*, which many have thought to assert, the ancient exercise of Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction by a *Bench of Presbyters of equal authority*, (which would be too large a digression to be here considered) yet even that notion also must fall under the heavy censure of this exception.

17. The other instance concerneth *private*

private Members, and the whole Church being abridged & deprived of that liberty to diſcharge their duty, which by the law of Chriſt they are to provide for. Among theſe duties he nameth *reproof, admonition, and exhortation* (as if theſe things were not allowed in our Church, which is an intimation that needeth reproof) and alſo *withdrawing from them that walk diſorderly, and putting ſuch obſtinate offenders from among them.* Now this inſtance alſo is built upon the bottom of Independency, groundleſly ſuppoſed to be a divine inſtitution. For the Independents allowing the Miniſters the principal care about the diſcipline of the Church, do aſſert an *authority and power* of Church-Government, to be ſeated in all the *members* of the Church, together with their Officers; yea that the *members of the Church may cenſure their Officers*; and ſome of them, as they of *New-England* expreſs it, that the *Keys are committed to all believers, who ſhall join together according to the ordinance of Chriſt.* And Dr. *O.* who gives ſomewhat more authority to Miniſters, than many others of them do, yet declareth his *non-admittance of our diſcipline,* upon this account as one, *as being in the hands of meerly Eccleſiaſtical perſons, or ſuch as are pretended*

P. 141, 142.

Decl. of Faith and Ord. of Congr. *Ch. Par.* 2. *St.* 4, 5, 7. Anſw. to 32. Queſt. *qu.* 14. & 15.

P. 256.

tended ſo to be. This late device, of diſcipline being exerciſed by an authoritative power of all the members of the Church, is claimed here as neceſſary for embracing Communion; but this is not only contrary to the Church of *England*, with the ancient Churches, and to the *French*, *Dutch*, and other reformed Churches abroad, but it is alſo directly oppoſed and refuted by the *Presbyterians*, both of *Scotland*, and *England*: and this alſo is a general argument, for ſeparation from all Chriſtian Aſſemblies, of the Primitive and Reformed Churches, except a few of themſelves.

Gilleſpy Gov. of Ch. of Scot. Part. 2. c. 1. & Poſtſcript. Jus Div. Reg. Eccleſ. Par. 2. c. 10.

18. But as under the former inſtance, he inſiſted much upon the great uſefulneſs of *adminiſtring* Church-diſcipline, which if rightly ſtated, and in its due meaſures, we heartily admit; ſo here he reflecteth upon the *defects* of exerciſing diſcipline among us, urging that upon ſuch defects, as by the deſign of his diſcourſe he repreſenteth ours to be, *pious men may without the leaſt ſuſpicion of the guilt of Schiſm, forſake the Communion of that Church, and if they have a due care of their own ſalvation, they will underſtand it to be a duty.* But what he intimately chargeth upon the Church of *England*, ſpeaking of the Church *where wicked perſons are admitted*

P. 244, 245.

admitted without diſtinction or diſcrimination unto the Communion of the Church, and tolerated therein without any procedure with them or againſt them: if this be generally underſtood of all wicked perſons as thoſe words *without diſtinction or diſcrimination* do import, it is untrue and ſlanderous. But if this be meant only of divers particular perſons: it is acknowledged that a more vigorous execution of diſcipline (which I have in the former Section noted to be hindred in the effects thereof, and not helped by diviſions and ſeparations) is deſireable, and would be advantageous to the Church. Yet here we muſt obſerve, 1. That ſome mens rigour would make the rules of Communion over-ſtrict and ſevere, which was the ground of the Schiſm of the *Novatians*, and *Donatiſts*, and as ſome have anciently related of the *Meletians* alſo: and it is not deſireable that the Churches authority ſhould be acted by ſuch heats. 2. That real defects in this particular (though they are not to be approved of) are no ſufficient ground for ſeparation, ſince ſuch blemiſhes were mixed with the beauty of the Apoſtolical Churches themſelves, as is manifeſt from almoſt all the Apoſtolical Epiſtles, and particularly from the firſt Epiſtle to the *Corinthians*, in

in which divers *miscarriages* were *taxed*, and yet unity was strictly commanded, and dividing severely rebuked. Yea this very discourse at sometimes will not own, *that this thing solely of it self is sufficient to justifie a separation*; and the Congregational Churches in *England*, in the Declaration of their Faith and order, affirmed, that *Church-members upon offences taken by them, having performed their duty*, (private admonition and relating it to the Church) *ought not to disturb any Church-order, or absent themselves from the publick assemblies, or the administration of any ordinances upon that pretence, but to wait upon Christ in the further proceeding of the Church.*

P. 126.

Of Institution and Order of Churches, Sect. 21.

Last Plea.

19. Another thing only touched in that discourse, (but which is the main ground of mis-apprehension) is, that there is (saith he) *no Evangelical obligation to local* (or external) *Communion, with any particular or parochial Church of this Nation*; because every man may *relinquish* it by *removing his habitation:* which plea floweth from want of a right sense of the *Church Catholick*. For every Christians obligation to keep Communion with the Church, is founded in his being visibly a *member of Christs body*, which includeth his visible fellowship with the whole

P. 256, 257.

whole Church, which he entreth upon by Baptiſm, and from hence he ſtandeth obliged to communicate, with that regular fixed part of this Church, where he reſideth, and from which he hath no warrantable or neceſſary cauſe of ſeparation. In this reſpect our *Parochial Aſſemblies* are of like nature with the Jewiſh *Synogogal Aſſemblies*, unto which they were not obliged by any ſpecial *Synagogal-Covenant*, but partly from Gods general command of their Aſſembling themſelves together; and partly from their Religious profeſſion and circumciſion, engaging them to Communion with the whole Church of the Jews, and thereby to their Synagogal-Communion. Hereupon under that diſpenſation, it was the practice of our Bleſſed Saviour, (whoſe example ſhould not be over-looked by us) to attend upon theſe Synagogal-Aſſemblies, and the Religious worſhip of God celebrated therein, as appears, *Luk.* 4. 16. *At* Nazareth *where he had been brought up, as his cuſtom was, he went into the Synagogue on the Sabbath-day.*

20. And can it enter into the heart of any Chriſtian to imagine, that the holy Apoſtles, who in their travels could not be fixed in any particular Congregation, did not ſtand bound by the duty of

Christian Unity, to join themselves in Communion, with the *particular fixed Churches* or Assemblies of Christians where they came, (as S. *Peter* at *Antioch*, S. *Paul* at *Jerusalem*, and divers other places) though such Churches were founded by some of the other Apostles? And upon this account of the *Unity* of the *body of Christ*, the Primitive Christians when they went abroad into other Regions, and distant parts of the World, did with a Religious care seek the *Communion* of the Churches where they came, and not to make *separate Assemblies*. Yea this is a thing so far acknowledged by our English *Independants* themselves, (though they can talk at another rate where it serves their interest) that in their publick Confession of Faith at the *Savoy*, they say, *All Saints are bound to maintain an holy fellowship and Communion, in the worship of God, which communion though especially to be exercised by them, in the relations wherein they stand, whether of Families, or Churches; yet as God affordeth opportunity, it is to be extended to all those, who in every place call upon the name of the Lord Jesus.*

Conf. Ch. 27. Sect. 2.

21. But the conditions required in any particular fixed Christian Assembly, embracing the Christian *Faith and Worship*, in

in the place of our reſidence, to make it our duty, upon the account of the *Chriſtian Unity* to join therein, are theſe two. 1. That our communicating therein doth not oblige us, to join in any *action* or *profeſſion* which is ſinful. This is acknowledged on all hands, and needeth no further proof; becauſe the Chriſtians duty, of keeping in Communion with *Chriſt* himſelf, doth require it. 2. That the Aſſembly we join in doth not maintain an *unwarrantable ſeparation*, from the Communion of the *eſtabliſhed Church*; for here to join in Communion, is to join in *ſeparation*, and is like *Barnabas* and the other *Jews*, joining with S. *Peter*, who all *walked contrary to the truth of the Goſpel*, in withdrawing from the Communion of the *Gentiles* at *Antioch*: and the communicating with ſuch a ſeparating Aſſembly, would be a breach of that *Apoſtolical command*, of *avoiding them who cauſe diviſions*, Rom. 16. 17. And we may obſerve, that the joining in needleſs ſeparations, being a ſin againſt the *commands* of Chriſt, which require Chriſtian Unity and Communion, can not be warranted by any *authority* upon earth, becauſe that authority can not diſpenſe with the commands of Chriſt, but ought to be ſubject to them; and therefore Gal. 2. 14.

Theod. Hiſt. l. 4. c. 22. Aug. Ep. 166.

as S. *Peter*'s practice and countenance, did not excuſe *Barnabas* and the other Jews; ſo neither could the *indulgence* of *Valens* the Emperour or his Predeceſſor, excuſe the *different Sects* by them *tolerated*, from being guilty of *Schiſm* and the breach of *Chriſtian duty*, in their diviſions, and ſeparations.

A fourth Notion of Schiſm.

22. Another notion of *Schiſm* there is, which condemneth ſeparation whereever Communion is *lawful*; but aſſumeth, that whereever any thing *unlawful or ſtrongly ſuſpected, is required in order to Communion, there to hold Communion would be to join in conſpiracy, and ſeparation is then both lawful and neceſſary.* Concerning which notion (granting that ſeparation is neceſſary, where any thing *unlawful* is required in order to Communion) I can not admit for truth, that if any thing *ſuſpected* be ſo required, ſeparation becometh *lawful* thereby. For if by *ſuſpected*, be meant whatſoever the perſon, who maketh the ſeparation, doth *ſuſpect* as evil; by this rule, he who through careleſneſs of enquiry, or prejudice and want of Charity, is *needleſly ſuſpicious* about any form of ſervice, or way of Church-Adminiſtrations, will be allowed to ſeparate, and to be therein free from *Schiſm*, or ſinful breach of *Unity*, only becauſe

Mr. H. Tract of Schiſm. p. 2,5,8,11.

he

he is void of *Charity* and wanting in due *Chriſtian care.*

23. Nor can it poſſibly be true, that if ſome thing be enjoined, which divers perſons who appear to be *Religious*, and are ſuppoſed to have conſiderable abilities of judgment, do upon *profeſſed enquiry*, both ſuſpect and *condemn*, that they may lawfully ſeparate, and not be guilty of *Schiſm*, if their judgments herein be *erroneous* and *ungrounded.* For though diligent *enquiry* where it is impartially made, is in this caſe an excuſe from the degree of the ſin, or from the precipitant or deſigned *breach* of *Charity or Unity*; yet where it is ſo ill managed, as to take up with an *errour*, and *practiſe* upon it; it can not render that practice allowable. For this would juſtifie almoſt every party, which in *judgment* holdeth an *errour*, for ſeparating from that Church, who either in her open *practice*, or in her publick *ſervice*, requireth a profeſſion of that truth which they oppoſe: and they muſt be excuſed from *Schiſm*, only becauſe they acknowledge not the right rules of *Religion*; and neither *Donatiſts*, *Novatians*, or *Anabaptiſts*, could then be blamed for their *diſtance* from the *Church*, provided it be founded in their *diſtance* from and diſowning of the *truth.* Yea

if any persons be *Arians*, *Eutychians*, or *Nestorians*, in opinion, (all which the author of this notion over-officiously excuseth from all *Heresie*, and saith they were at the worst but *Schisms*) they must also according to his notion, stand excused from *Schism*, in separating from the Church, which holdeth the true doctrine, and openly in her service requireth a profession of it, concerning the person of the *Mediator*.

Vbi supra p. 9, 10.

24. This would set up the power of an *erring judgment*, above the will of God, to *discharge* persons from what is Gods command, and would else have been their duty, (*viz.* Communion) and to *give them authority* to do that as a lawful action, which to others who err not is a *grievous sin*, (*viz.* separation from that Church which holdeth the truth, meerly because it doth profess it) as if the *errour* of man could render *necessary duties*, and *divine commands*, to be of *no obligation*. For though their errour may (till it be removed) *entangle* them in sin, in joining with the Church, because this encludeth a practising what they judge unlawful; it can not *justifie* them from sin in separating from it, but this errour (as all other *erroneous judgments* do, where good and evil are *mistaken* for each other)

other) doth in their practice every way *enſnare* them under ſin, until it be cured. But of the principal deſign of this notion, I ſhall give a further account in conſidering things under ſcruples. *Lib.* 2. *c.* 2. *Sect.* 3.

25. From what hath been hitherto diſcourſed, it appeareth, that the conſideration of *Schiſm*, will make it neceſſary for him who undertaketh *ſeparation*, to be ſure that he acteth upon *unerring grounds*, and not upon *miſtakes*: becauſe to make ſeparation from a Church, which (however it be *miſunderſtood* and *cauſeleſly cenſured*) requireth nothing in it ſelf *abſolutely unlawful*, to be believed, profeſſed, practiſed, or joined in, is to be guilty of the *great ſin* of *Schiſm*.

SECT. V.

Of the duty of obedience to Rulers and Governours, *and the due exerciſe of the Miniſterial function, which is in this caſe concerned.*

1. The oppoſing *Conformity* if managed upon inſufficient grounds, hath ordinarily involved the perſon oppoſing under the ſin of *diſobedience*, and want of ſubjection in things lawful to *Chriſtian Governours* and *Rulers*, and their Laws and Conſtitutions; which ought to be obeyed, *not only for wrath, but for Conſcience ſake.*

It is their duty in their place to shew themselves the *servants of God*, and to promote his glory, and to that end by their power and authoritative commands, to take care for the promoting and preserving the *Order*, *Peace*, and *Unity* of *the Church of God*: and towards both *Ecclesiastical* and *secular* Rulers, the divine Precepts do very plainly require our obedience. Indeed if any thing any time commanded be really *sinful*, the instructions given in the *Church of England* will direct us to *believe undoubtedly, that we may not obey Kings, Magistrates, or any other, though they be our own Fathers, if they would command us to do any thing contrary to Gods Commandment.* But if the things be lawful which they command (as in this case I hope to make appear to men of unprejudiced minds) it is a sin of *no low degree* to disobey; and the duty of obedience is so considerable, that the Compilers of the *Strasburgh* Confession of Faith, expressed it to be *Inter primi ordinis bona opera, in the highest rank and order of good works.*

Hom. of Obedience. Part. 2.

Conf. Argent. c. 23.

2. Nor can this *obedience* be thought a matter inconsiderable, which was enjoined of old in the first Commandment of the second table; and as *Philo* observed, includeth part of the first table, and part

Phil. de Leg. Specialib.

part of the ſecond, having directly a reſpect both to *God* in his *Vice-gerent*, and alſo to *man*. And this is earneſtly preſſed upon us in the *Goſpel doctrine*, as a means whereby we may bring honour to *Religion* and *Chriſtianity*, by S. *Peter*, 1 *Pet.* 2. 12,--15. and as a neceſſary practice to *expreſs* true *converſion*, from the ſtate of ſin to the life of God, by S. *Paul*, *Tit.* 3. 1,--5. who alſo warneth againſt this ſin, with reſpect to the danger of *damnation* thereby, *Rom.* 13. 2. And this obedience to them who are over us, in things *lawful* and under their *authority*, is of ſo high and neceſſary a conſequence, that without it there can be no *peace*, nor any *regular* and *unconfuſed ſtate*, in any Family, City, Realm, or Church: this being the practice of the grand *Maxim* for the upholding order in all Societies of the World, which is evident by its own light, and is a principle of the *law of nature*.

3. Another effect of theſe *diſagreements* about the eſtabliſhed order of our Church, hath been this; that divers *Miniſters* have declined the orderly, regular and publick exerciſe, of their *Miniſterial functions*. And conſidering the *weightineſs* of their *Commiſſion*, with the greatneſs of their *charge* and *account*, and the

the exceeding advantage to the *Church*, yea to the honour of *Christ* and the salvation of men, by their labours where they obtain *success*, together with other their *own concernments*; it becometh them to be well assured that they have had a *warrantable plea* to justifie those *proceedings*. It was not without cause accounted a great miscarriage and default in *Novatus*, that before he openly became the head of a *dividing party*, he was over-forward for want of a due *zeal* to *Religion*, to have relinquished the office of *Presbyter*, to which he was ordained, and to betake himself to another kind of life.

Euſ. Hiſt. Eccleſ. l. 6. c. 43.

4. The *ancient Church* shewed its great dislike and distast, of any Ministers *declining* the orderly execution of his Ministry, by determining that *if any Bishop, Presbyter, or Deacon, being ordained did not undertake his Ministration, he must be separated from the Christian Society*, and *deprived of Ecclesiastical Communion*. And with equal severity they condemned that *Minister*, who *refused* the regular work and place of his *Ministry*, and him who *undertook* the place but *minded* not the work and duty, *behaving* himself *negligently* in not attending the care of the people.

Can. Ap. 36. Conc. Antioch. c. 17.

Can. Ap. 58.

5. From

5. From what I have expreſſed hitherto, we may take a ſhort *proſpect* of the *evils* flowing from theſe *contentions*, which are ſuch as theſe; the *prejudicing* men againſt the holy adminiſtrations of *Gods ſervice*, the promoting *wrath* and *ſtrife*, and the quenching *Chriſtian love*; the being a *ſtumbling-block* to the weak, *hardning* the careleſs, and being an occaſion of much *irreligion*, *grieving* the *godly*, and every way *gratifying* the Churches *Enemies*, and hindring its welfare and the *growth of Piety*; the hurtful *diſturbance* of the *Churches Peace*, and *endangering* the *Kingdoms intereſt*, and the promoting of dangerous and *dreadful Schiſms*: nor is the *diſobedience* to Magiſtrates, and the *deſerting* the Miniſterial charge unconcerned herein. And all theſe things (if God in his mercy put not a *ſtop* to them, by directing mens minds to a *right underſtanding*, and turning their hearts into a more *peaceable and amicable frame* and *temper*) may prove alſo very dangerous and hurtful in the next Generation, to the *diſhonour* of *God*, the diſcredit of *Religion*, and the ruine of many thouſand *ſouls*: which ſad *conſequences* plainly enough ſhew theſe unhappy *conteſts*, rather to gratifie the deſigns of the *deſtroyer*, than of the *Saviour*;

our; and to be fruits growing from a *root* of *bitterneſs*. In theſe reſpects I think he was not far from the mark, who called this diſagreement about Conformity, *the ſaddeſt difference that ever happened in the Church of* England.

Ful. Church Hiſt. l. 7. p. 401.

SECT. VI.

A propoſal concerning due conſiderateneſs in this Caſe; and the deſign of this treatiſe manifeſted.

1. After I have ſhewed the ſad fruits of theſe *diſſentions*, I muſt ſtill acknowledge, that I doubt not but that there are *diſſenters*, who act out of true *principles* of *Conſcience*; and deſign to walk in *piety* to *God*, and in *love* and *peace* towards men: to ſuch perſons though they be of *different judgments*, (yea though ſome of them too far *indulge* their *paſſions*) I profeſs an hearty reſpect and *brotherly love*, conſidering that wiſe and good men are lyable to *miſtake* and *err*, ſtill retaining this as a teſtimony of their *integrity*, that they are willing to be *informed*, and in practice to embrace what is their duty, when it ſhall be ſo *evidenced*.

2. S. *Cyprian* who was a great *promoter*

ter of Truth, Piety, and Peace, and wrote ſome tracts purpoſely to correct the fierceneſs, of them eſpecially who were of his own opinion (*viz. de bono patientiæ, & de zelo & livore*) for want of better information, but with openly avowed *diſlike* of *breach* of *communion*, lived, and for what appeared to S. *Auſtin* died alſo, in that errour about *baptizing Hereticks*. But had he rightly underſtood the truth, he would no doubt have *rejected* his *errour*, as thoſe *Biſhops* who were of the ſame opinion with him are related to have done, both in the *Eaſtern Church* and in the *African*, whereupon the Church enjoyed *peace*, and was filled with exceeding abundant *joy*: and *Pamelius* thinketh that S. *Cyprian* himſelf livedto do the ſame.

Cyp. in Conc. Carth. & Epiſt. ad Jubaian.

Aug. Ep. 48.

Euſ. Hiſt. Eccl. l. 7. *c.* 5. *Hieron. adv. Lucif. Pamel. in Vit. Cypr.*

3. And the women who out of *love*, but in their *errour*, came to anoint *Jeſus*, deſigning it as a rite belonging to his *burial*, when they ought according to his doctrine, (which they did not yet underſtand) to have believed that it was the day of his reſurrection, meeting with *Jeſus* himſelf who expreſſed his favour unto them; were forthwith ready to have their *miſtakes diſcovered*, and with joy upon *conviction* to *yield* both their *judgments*, and thereupon their *practices* to be

be *rectified*. Erring acts from *miſtake* of judgment, are herein of the ſame nature with other *infirmities* of Chriſtians, in that the being of them is conſiſtent with the true nature of *Chriſtian life*; whereas the wilful *perſiſting* in them, and the *deſigned promoting* of them againſt *evidence*, is contrary thereto. For that is for men to *reſolve* not to *deny themſelves*, or to ſubmit to *God*; but to *oppoſe* his mind and *will* if it be contrary to their own.

4. Wherefore I muſt intreat my Reader if he be a perſon *diſſatisfied* about the matters treated of in this diſcourſe, that he would *make a ſtand*, and give me leave to propoſe, what his own intereſt will engage him to admit. That before he proceedeth any further, he would *ſeriouſly reſolve* himſelf theſe two things. Firſt, whether with reflexion upon what hath been ſaid, he would not be heartily unwilling to ſtand charged *in the ſight of God*, with being any way ſinfully inſtrumental unto ſo much hurt, as is conſequent upon being unwarrantably *engaged* in theſe *contentions* and *oppoſitions*? Secondly, whether he be reſolvedly willing to lay aſide all *prejudice*, and deſigned *ſerving* any opinion or party; and to aim impartially to keep a good *conſcience*, and

in

in judgment and practice, to entertain all evidences of *truth*, in this enquiry about *Conformity?*

5. If any man ſhould anſwer either of theſe two things in the *Negative*, he muſt be a man of an *irreligious Spirit* willing to ruine himſelf, and of a *pernicious Spirit* ready to deſtroy others; and whilſt he remaineth thus ſtrongly *prepoſſeſſed*, he is never like to be advantaged by this diſcourſe, or any other of the ſame ſubject; but it is moſt neceſſary for him to become *better inſtructed*, in that chief principle of *Chriſtian practice*, to which he is yet a ſtranger, *viz.* The great neceſſity in order to *ſalvation*, of minding *uprightneſs* to *God*, and the doing his will, above *gratifying* his own *affections*, or the pleaſure of any other men. But as to him who anſwered theſe two things in the *affirmative*, I only entreat him to proceed in the remaining part of this diſcourſe, with the ſame frame and *temper of Spirit.*

6. I come now to examine the matters themſelves, to which *Conformity* referreth, which from the premiſes, appeareth to be of very conſiderable uſe, and tendeth to the reſolving divers *caſes* of *Conſcience*, and (if God pleaſe to vouchſafe ſo great a mercy to us) to promote

promote the *Churches peace* and *Unity*, the Miniſters comfortable *diſcharge* of his duty, the common advancement of *Chriſtianity*, and the *Proteſtant Profeſſion*, and the particular edification of *Chriſtians*. In order to the contributing ſomewhat towards theſe excellent ends, I have undertaken this *diſcourſe*, beſeeching *the God of wiſdom and knowledge* to guide and lead me, that I may clearly underſtand and manifeſt what is *truth*, and that he would ſo move on the hearts of others, that they who err by *miſtake* may attain to a right judgment, and that thoſe who act out of any *ſpirit of oppoſition*, may have their *hearts reformed*, and be made *willing* to mind their *duty*.

Surveigh of Grand Caſe, *caſe 6.*

7. And becauſe among the other things required of Miniſters who conform, many diſſenters have expreſſed themſelves to be moſt *diſſatisfied* about the clauſes concerning the *Covenant*, and ſome who have undertaken to make a *Surveigh* of theſe things, (though they may be miſtaken in the meaſure of their ground) have declared, that this is the *great mountain in their way, to be removed by the Faith of miracles*; I ſhall in the firſt place take that into conſideration, and manifeſt that there is a ready, ſafe, and direct paſſage, without any great *difficulty* or need

of

of *miracles*, over that which only appeareth to them to be a *mountain*; if we be willing to walk in the plain paths, to which we are *directed* by the *Scripture rules*.

8. And whereas in the other particulars excepted againſt, there is nothing *more* (if ſo much) *diſliked and oppoſed*, than what is contained in the *Liturgy*, and particularly the *Ceremonies*; I ſhall endeavour in the remaining part of this Book, to give a true account of theſe things, the right underſtanding whereof, may be very conducible towards the *Churches peace*, and the *general good*.

CHAP. II.

Of the Covenant.

SECT. I.

Of its being an unlawful Oath.

1. THE acknowledgment to be made by Miniſters, concerning the *Covenant*, being no permanent Conſtitution, may require the ſhorter diſcourſe. Yet it is needful that ſo much be ſaid as to manifeſt that while it is for the preſent continued, and until it ſhall be withdrawn and abated, it ought not to be an obſtacle to any, in the entrance upon Eccleſiaſtical adminiſtrations (or civil offices.) To this end I ſhall firſt conſider the Oath it ſelf, that it was *in it ſelf unlawful*; and then its *obligation* ſo far as that is concerned in this acknowledgment.

2. Now an Oath may be accounted *unlawful in it ſelf*, with reſpect to the wholſom laws of the land: and upon this account any Oath (eſpecially concerning publick affairs of Government) is unlawful in it ſelf, where either the matter, or the conſtitution and framing, is unwarrantable

warrantable according to the law. That the Covenant (and its Impoſition) was in this reſpect *unlawful*, will be eaſily admitted by all impartially conſidering perſons, who cannot be ſuppoſed to acknowledge, that whatſoever (either for, or againſt their own intereſt) obtaineth in any wiſe a vote in the two Houſes, but is not aſſented to, but diſallowed by the King, hath a ſufficient legal and *warrantable conſtitution*. And accordingly by the higheſt authoritative way of reſolution, this Oath is declared *Unlawful*, by a publick Act in our Statute Laws. 13 car. 2. 1.

3. And its not having a legal Conſtitution (beſides what reſpecteth the particular matter thereof) is ſufficient to render it unlawful in it ſelf, according to the *law of God*, which eſtabliſheth order, commandeth obedience to Government, and ſubjection to all wholſom humane laws. For by the law of God the Oaths of Subjects againſt the will of their Rulers for altering matters of Government muſt be declared to be unlawful, as not being according to the rule of righteouſneſs. And it is not the matter only which maketh an Oath or Promiſe *Unlawful in it ſelf*, but all other neceſſary ingredients or attendants, may have the like effect and influence; as the conſideration of

the perſon who taketh the Oath, with reſpect to his capacity and authority, and many other ſuch like things, which the Canoniſts have expreſſed in this diſtick; *Sit jusjurandum licitum decerne; notato Quis, cui, quid, per quid, ad quid, cur, quomodo, quando.* Agreeable thereunto *Filiucius* a Caſuiſt maketh an expreſs diſtinction, between *promiſſio illicita ex parte materiæ*, and *promiſſio illicita per ſeipſam*; telling us that a promiſe made by a Son againſt the prohibition of his father, may be a lawful promiſe as to the *matter* of it, but yet it is an unlawful promiſe *in it ſelf*, as encluding in it ſelf an unlawful thing; that is, diſobedience to his Father.

Sayr. Clar. Reg. l. 5. c. 3.

Martin Margaret. Decret. Filiuc. Trac. 25. n. 204.

4. But touching the matter of the Covenant being unlawful, I might note, that that clauſe expreſſing them who take the Covenant to *be of one reformed Religion*, and that they had *before their eyes the glory of God, and the honour of the King*; was either not ſo true, or not ſo well known concerning one another, as that they might ſafely expreſs it in a warrantable Oath. And what concerned the *doctrine, worſhip, diſcipline* and *Government of* Scotland *and* Ireland, was that which could not be underſtood, as the matter of an Oath ſhould be, by ordinary perſons

perſons in *England* who were required to take it. And that clauſe, declaring that this Covenant was made *according to the commendable practice of theſe Kingdoms in former times*, did not only require them who took it to be well skilled in Hiſtory, but alſo declareth former open combinations of Subjects by Oath, againſt the mind and will of their Prince, to alter the affairs of Government, to be *commendable practices:* which is to aſſert what is contrary unto truth.

5. And how much it was in the matter of it Unlawful, by its deſigned tendency to promote a civil War (even againſt the King) may alſo be conſidered. For though the King was known to oppoſe this Oath, yet the Covenant engaged them who took it, *according to their places and callings to aſſiſt & defend all thoſe that entred into this League and Covenant in the maintenance and purſuing thereof.* And alſo that they ſhould *all the days of their lives continue therein againſt all oppoſition.* And that this phraſe *acording to our place and callings* was not underſtood nor intended in the Covenant, and by the contrivers thereof, in the due limited ſenſe (though many private perſons did ſo take it) is manifeſt by conſidering what kind of *aſſiſtence* to each

other was by them practiſed, before, at, and after the taking the Covenant; and alſo becauſe the taking this phraſe in ſuch a ſtrict reſtrained ſenſe, would have been utterly inconſiſtent with what is joyned therewith, *viz.* the *aſſiſting and defending* all thoſe that enter into this League and Covenant, in the maintaining and purſuing thereof, to *continue* therein againſt all oppoſition, and not to be *withdrawn from it by what ſoever perſwaſion or terrour:* ſince all this was againſt the Kings known command and open Proclamation.

6. As this Covenant had reſpect to the affairs of the Church, it appeareth unlawful upon a double account. 1. That *endeavour*, intended in the Covenant for the alteration of Doctrine, Worſhip, Diſcipline, and Government, was in the nature thereof an Unlawful endeavour: for thereby Subjects did undertake of themſelves, though without legal authority, and without and againſt the Kings conſent, to alter, oppoſe, and expel what was eſtabliſhed by the Laws of the Land. To this purpoſe the Covenant it ſelf in the beginning thereof declareth, that *after other means of ſupplication, remonſtrance, proteſtation, &c.* now at laſt they enter into a League wherein (Art. 1.

and

and 2.) they engaged themſelves to this *endeavour.* Wherefore that endeavour cannot include ſuch means as ſupplication to the King, *&c.* which are called *other means* than what they then deſigned. And according to this ſenſe, the Aſſembly, notwithſtanding the Kings prohibitive Declaration, declared, that *to give publick teſtimony of their endeavour for Uniformity in divine worſhip, which they promiſed in the Covenant, they reſolved to lay aſide the former Liturgy, and agreed on the Directory.* And the then two Houſes without the Kings conſent and againſt his Declaration, proceeding, as themſelves there expreſſed, according to their *Covenant to reform Religion,* did undertake by their ordinance to *aboliſh the Book of Common-Prayer*, and to *repeal all ſtatutes* which enjoined it, and to *eſtabliſh the Directory:* and in like manner they proceeded in their other Ordinances of *Oct. 9th.* 1646. for *aboliſhing* the name, title, ſtile, and dignity of *Archbiſhop and Biſhop*, and of *Aug.* 29. 1648. for eſtabliſhing a new way of *diſcipline & ordination.* And in the two ſeveral ordinances for aboliſhing Biſhops, and ſelling their lands, there is a ſpecial proviſion to this purpoſe, *To ſave and preſerve all other rights, titles & intereſts, other than the King's, and his*

Pref. to the Directory.

Ordin. Jan. 3. 1644.

Ordin. Oct. 9. 1546.

Nov. 16. 1648.

Heirs and Succeſſors, the Archbiſhops, and Biſhops, &c. which words carry an appearing indication of ſome conviction, that thoſe endeavours againſt Epiſcopacy were not every way lawful and according to right.

7. The matter of the Covenant was alſo Unlawful, as it deſigned the *extirpation of Church government by Archbiſhops and Biſhops.* For to engage the rooting out of all Epiſcopacy, which ever ſince the Apoſtles times hath been eſtabliſhed in the Church, and under which our own Nation received its reformation, is to Covenant to aboliſh that, which (after all Books of controverſie hitherto written) may fairly plead for a divine inſtitution; and no man (how confident ſoever) can be ſufficiently ſecure, that he doth not act againſt the will of Chriſt, while he deſigneth to reject it; and therefore an Oath to this end and purpoſe cannot be a *lawful Oath.* With what indignation ſuch actings would have been looked upon by the Primitive Chriſtians, may appear by the Canons of the ancient, general, and Provincial Councils, wherein all *combinations by Oath* (though they were not ſo high as this of the Covenant) whether by Clergy or Laity againſt their *Biſhops* were in the higheſt manner, and

Conc. Chalc. c. 18. *Con. Trull. c.* 34. *Aurel.* 3. *c.* 21. *C.* 11. *q.* 1. *Conſpirationum.*

with

with the greateſt ſeverity condemned and cenſured.

8. I know that ſome have written that the Covenant did not intend wholly to aboliſh but to regulate Epiſcopacy. But other Covenanters have earneſtly oppoſed this, and tell us that the Government is to be *extirpated, not by mutation, mutilation, limitation, or regulation, but utter abolition, una cum ſtirpe evellere.* And that Parliament by whoſe ordinance the Covenant was taken, when they ſet upon this extirpation, did deſign the taking away even the *title, ſtile, name and dignity of Arch-biſhop and Biſhop.* And as this reſtrained interpretation (which was the ſenſe of divers particular perſons) maketh ſomewhat a violent expoſition, of the *extirpation* expreſſed in the ſecond Article, ſo it directly claſheth with the firſt Article, where by the *Church of Scotland* (over-looking the Biſhops there) under its Presbytery, which profeſſed a great oppoſition to every little appearance of any fixed Epiſcopacy, was made the Idea, according to which, the Church of *England* muſt be reformed. Now in *Scotland* according to their *form of Church Poliey*, 1560. they had *Superintendents or Biſhops*, who were to uſe Epiſcopal power in many things, were choſen and approved

Surveigh of the Grand Caſe, *p.* 44.

Biſhop *Spotſwood* Hiſt. of Ch. of *Scotl. l.* 3. *p.* 159, 160.

ved by the Miniſters, and were ſubject to the cenſures of the Miniſters and Elders, and were not required to have Epiſcopal Ordination: and yet even theſe Superintendents, in the modelling their Presbytery (after the new *form of policy* was introduced 1578.) were rejected, and diſclaimed and exploded in the aſſembly at *Dundee*, 1580. as having neither *foundation, ground nor warrant in the word of God.*

Ibid. lib. 6. p. 311.

9. And thus having taken a ſhort, plain, and direct view of divers things in the Covenant, it muſt needs ſeem exceeding ſtrange (unleſs the intereſt of parties, or prejudices, have the chief and principal influence upon ſome mens ſcruples) that divers perſons, who profeſs themſelves extreamly ſcrupulous, concerning the lawfulneſs of other things which are very juſtifiable, ſhould be as far in the other extream confident aſſerters of the lawfulneſs of this Oath, without any ſcruple, and even to impatience of all contradiction.

SECT.

SECT. II.

That no man is obliged by this Oath to endeavour any alteration of the Government.

1. Though ſome phraſes in the Covenant, which had reſpect to the King, were truly declared by himſelf to be *dubious and dangerous*, and were to ſuch purpoſes made uſe of by ſome violent Spirits, yet I ſhall preſume it now granted, that no man is by that Oath obliged to endeavour any alteration of the Government in the State. But I ſhall here undertake to manifeſt, that there lyeth *no obligation from the Covenant* upon any perſon who took it, *to endeavour any alteration of the Government in the Church*, though he might intend this in the entring upon that Oath. And this I ſhall evidence by propounding four Rules.

2. The firſt Rule is, That *Superiours juſt rights may not be violated.* But if the voluntary Vows or Oaths of Inferiours, made againſt the conſent and command of their Superiours, concerning things belonging to their Government (which is the preſent caſe) did bind them to proſecute what they did ſo undertake; then muſt

muſt it be acknowledged lawful, that the Superiours right and authority be taken away, without his own conſent, and that the duties of Obedience, the divine Ordinances of Rule and Dominion, and together therewith all peace may be rooted out of the World. This will be manifeſt by conſidering the Oath of a *Servant*, that he will not do ſuch buſineſs as he thinketh his Maſter intendeth for him; of a *Child*, that he will have none of thoſe orders nor ſervants in his Fathers family, which his Father approveth; or of an *Army*, that they will not engage in a Battel, or undertake any march though they be thereto commanded. And like to theſe is the Oath of a *Subject*, to determine matters of publick Government, againſt the law, and the mind of his Soveraign. And if other inferiours ſhould in the like caſe as forwardly make contrary vows; if theſe ſhould alſo be ſuppoſed of neceſſary obligation againſt their ſuperiours right, this would *perpetuate endleſs quarrels* between theſe parties, and *baniſh ſubjection* from them both.

3. And a very great conſent of Writers, of different perſwaſions in other things, might be produced, to ſhew that ſuch Oaths of Inferiours cannot be obligatory:

gatory: as Biſhop *Saunderſon de oblig. Juram. Prælec.* 4. *Sect.* 5. *& Præl.* 7. *Sect.* 6. *Aquinas* 22^ae *q.* 89. *a.* 9. *ad* 3^m *Grot. de Jur. Bel. & Pac. l.* 2. *c.* 13. *Sect.* 20. *Perkins* Caſes of Conſc. *l.* 2. *c.* 13. *q.* 3. *Ameſ.* Caſ. Conſc. *l.* 4. *c.* 22. *n.* 26, 30, 35. and the *Auguſtane Confeſſion.* Thus God appointed, that if the *Father* declared againſt the vow of his *Daughter*, or the *Husband* againſt the vow of his *Wife*, that vow ſhould be void and of none effect, *Num.* 30. 3, 4, *&c.* which was, as *Philo Judæus* obſerveth, becauſe they were under the dominion of others, and might vow things incommodious to them.

Conf. Aug. cap. de Vot. Monach.

Phil. de leg. ſpecial. ad præc. 3^m.

4. But the King who hath in this Realm the chief Government in matters Eccleſiaſtical, as well as in others, did diſallow and openly declare againſt this Oath, by his *Proclamation* of *Oct.* 9. in the *19th.* year of his Reign, which may be ſeen in the *Bibliotheca Regia*, being many years ſince therein reprinted, and was long before urged to this purpoſe, by the Univerſity of *Oxford.* After this among other large conceſſions, the King declared that he could not conſent to the *Covenant*, both from *Newport* in the Iſle of *Wight*, *Sept.* 29. 1648. and from *Holmby*, *May* 12. 1647. Wherefore the King did ſeveral times manifeſt his diſallowing the Covenant,

Judic. Acad. Oxon. p. 8.

Covenant, and even with particular respect to its endeavouring the *alteration* of the Government in the Church, as may be collected from the view of his own words: and thereby any intended obligation from this Oath, to alter this Government, became thenceforth void to all his subjects, agreeably to the like case, *Num.* 30. 9, 10, 11, 12, 13.

5. A second Rule is, *That the doctrine of Christ should be the guide of our practice.* Now it was the tradition of the Scribes and Pharisees, *Mat.* 15. 4, 5, 6. and *Mar.* 7. 10, 11, 12. that though God commanded the *honouring the Father & Mother*, (which included the providing for them things convenient) he who had made a vow not consistent with this duty, ought not to relieve them against his vow. And though there be some variety in the critical exposition of the words of the Evangelists; divers taking the Δῶρον in S. *Matthew*, and the *Corban* in S. *Mark*, for the gift or thing devoted it self; *Petitus* from *Josephus* (*Ant. l.* 4. *c.* 4.) accounteth *Corban* to be the name of a *votary* who had vowed only to mind the Ministery of God; others as *Grotius*, *Coccеius*, and some of our own Writers, after *Masius* most probably esteem *Corban* to be the form of a Vow or Oath, which the

Lect. Var. l. 1. *c.* 4.

Grot. de Jur. B. & P. l. 2. *c.* 17.

Cocc. in Gemar. Sanh. c. 7.

the Jews expreſs, קרבן שאני נהנה לך yet in all theſe different ways of reſolution, there is a ſufficient agreement, concerning the ſubſtance and ſenſe of the Phariſaical doctrine. But this their doctrine our Saviour condemneth, as a *tranſgreſſing the Commandment of God by their traditions*, Mat. 15. 3. and *making the Commandment of God of none effect*. v. 6. &c.

6. Now the ſame command, *Honour thy Father and thy Mother* (and divers precepts of the Goſpel) doth enjoin obedience to Governours and Rulers. And our Soveraign and our Laws do eſtabliſh the preſent Government in the Church, and thereby do require ſubjects to ſubmit to it and receive it; and therefore according to the doctrine of Chriſt, no Vow or Oath ought to be accounted to diſoblige men from this duty of obedience, which is enjoyned by the Commandment of God. And the pretence made by ſome, that they are *far from thinking that the Covenant obliged them to reſiſt authority, but yet it doth undoubtedly oblige to forbear their own conſent to what they there renounced*; this would agree well with the intent of the Phariſees tradition, while the Son might tell his Father, that he acknowledged his vow could not oblige him to do his Father wrong; but yet he

Second Paper of Propoſals 1661.

he was bound that in these present circumstances he might not consent to yield him relief. But such things are of a direct contrary tendency to the doctrines of Christ.

7. A third Rule is, *That every obligation of an Oath of contract, ceaseth by the mutual consent of the contractors*; and therefore had the Covenant been every way warrantable, the obligation by contract therein, to endeavour the alteration of the Government of the Church, would have ceased, by the Parliaments of all these three Nations disclaiming any such obligation. And that such an Oath ceaseth to bind, when we have the desire or consent of them to whose concernment it hath particular reference, is asserted by such Writers as treat of this matter, as *Aquinas*, *Grotius*, Bishop *Saunderson*, *Amesius*, and divers others; and this hath been also admitted and insisted upon, by some chief defenders of the Covenant, particularly by Mr. *Henderson*, in his first Paper to the King. And the reason hereof is evident, because every person, society, or community, may recede from their own right and priviledge. Thus after the *two spies* had made a general Oath to *Rahab*, to preserve her and her Fathers house alive (which was a priviledge

22æ q. 89. a. 9. ad 2^m. *De J. B. & P. l. 2. c. 13. Sect. 18. De Obl. Juram. Præl. 7. Sec. 8. De Consc. l. 4. c. 22. Sect. 37.*

ledge ſhe obtained) by agreement between her and them it was reſolved, that this Oath ſhould not bind, if either ſhe or her Fathers family, were not within the *doors of her houſe*. And thus if any two Kingdoms ſhould *by Oath engage*, to traffick in ſome commodities with none other but among themſelves only; if this contract be afterwards judged prejudicial to both their intereſts, and the publick authority on both ſides yield to have it *altered*, and *quit all claim* of any ſuch peculiar right of trade, the obligation of that Oath is thereby *diſſolved*. *Joſ.* 2. 12, 13, 17, 21.

8. That the Covenant was deſigned to be an Oath of contract between divers ſubjects of theſe Nations appeareth, becauſe as it is all along ſtiled the ſolemn *League* and Covenant, ſo in the beginning thereof it is declared, *We the Noblemen, Barons, &c. determined to enter into a mutual and ſolemn League and Covenant*: and a *mutual League* cannot be otherwiſe, than an Oath of contract. And whereas this Oath in the ſixth Article thereof, is ſtiled their *Union and Conjunction*, and in the end of it, it is called *an aſſociation and Covenant*, all this doth intimate, that its obligation was intended towards one another. Wherefore ſince

any obligation from the Covenant to alter the Government, is disclaimed and rejected by the Parliaments of *England* and *Ireland*, and also by the rescissory act (as I find it termed) in *Scotland*, it must hereby become void, though it had been otherwise binding.

9. A fourth Rule is, *That what the general judgment of the best Christians of all ages have condemned as sin, ought not to be admitted.* But they have all acknowledged it a sin, that an Oath so far as it is against any right, should be persisted in as being obligatory. And it is as reasonable to doubt, of ordinary travellers knowing the road they have long used, as to question whether the most eminent Christians since Christ, did ever arrive at the understanding of those plain duties of Religion, which are of frequent practice.

10. When *Novatus* made a Schism in the Roman Church against *Cornelius*, he, in delivering the Holy Sacrament, gave to his followers this Oath; *Swear to me by the body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, that thou wilt never leave me, nor return to* Cornelius: and yet both *S. Cyprian* and other Catholick Bishops every where, judged these men bound to return, and condemned their continuance with

Euseb. Hist Eccl. l. 6. c. 44.

with *Novatus*, in the breach of Peace and Unity. *Evagrius* relateth that when *Mauritius* the Emperour ſent *Philippicus* to command his Army, they bound themſelves by Oath, not to owne him for their Commander: but when the Emperour perſiſted in his purpoſe, and ſent a Biſhop to treat with them, they were at laſt ſatisfied, that they ought to receive him, notwithſtanding their Oath. And when *Anacletus* was ſet up to govern the Roman Church, in oppoſition to *Innocentius* the ſecond, ſome perſons told S. *Bernard*, that they could not receive *Innocentius*, becauſe they were bound by an Oath to hold to *Anacletus* againſt him. But S. *Bernard* anſwered, *inſanire eos qui rem illicitam Sacramenti patrocinio conſtare exiſtimant*; *that it is a madneſs to think, that any thing not lawful of it ſelf can be defended by their Oath*; *whereas* (ſaid he) *ſuch diſorderly agreements, under whatſoever pretence of Religion they be eſtabliſhed, are to be accounted void, and by the authority of God to be diſſolved.*

Evagr. Hiſt. l. 6. c. 6.

Vit. S. Bern. lib. 2. c. 5.

Spelm. Conc. Brit. in leg. Aſſ. 1. Novel. 51. Dig. l. 2. Tit. 14. Juriſc.

11. That nothing otherwiſe unwarrantable can become a duty by any Oath, was declared in the *Eccleſiaſtical laws of Alfred*, and by the Councils of *Baſil*, *Seſſ.* 4. of *Lerida*, *Can.* 7. and of *Toledo* 8. *Can.* 2. and in ſeveral places of the civil

Cod. l. 9. Tit. 8. Conſt. 2.

Law; and by all our Proteſtant Writers, treating of the vow of ſingle life, in them who have not the gift of continency. And this is ſo agreeable to all rational principles, that it was received among the *ancient Roman Laws*, before the Empire became Chriſtian; and is likewiſe declared by *Philo the Jew*. And in the Canon Law, *Gratian* reſolved by divers ancient authorities, that an Oath againſt the duty of obedience being ſinful, cannot oblige: and the like is aſſerted in the *Gregorian decretals*; both which are in this matter received with good approbation by Proteſtant Writers.

Phil. de leg. ſpecial. C. 22. q. 3 & 4. Lib. 2. tit. 24. cap. 12. & 19.

12. Now I ſhall not think it neceſſary to anſwer objections, but ſhall content my ſelf to note, that whatſoever objection may preſs ſome one of the rules abovementioned, doth ſtill leave the main deſign ſecure, unleſs all theſe rules could be invalidated. And ſuch objections as carry an appearance of proof, that an Oath may oblige to what otherwiſe would not be warrantable, have this manifeſt *indication of miſtake*, becauſe they tend to uphold this monſtrous poſition, that men are bound to obſerve Gods commands and their duties no longer, than till they ſhall pleaſe to make an Oath againſt them.

CHAP.

CHAP. III.

Of the Declaration and Subscription referring to the Liturgy.

1. SOme open acknowledgement or subscription, not only to doctrines, but also to other *rules* and *Ecclesiastical Constitutions*, hath been a thing very usual in the Christian Church; and in matters lawful and orderly, hath been thought desirable to promote Peace, and continue well established order therein; and the expediency thereof standeth recommended, by the wisdom and ordinary practice of the Church.

2. In the Council of *Nice*, the returning *Novatians* who were received in the Clergy, were required by *subscription* to testify, that they would conform to the Catholick practice, and the Constitutions and Decrees of the Catholick Church. The ancient Custom of subscribing to their Synodical Constitutions, is evident from divers ancient Councils: which was also practised in the *Carthaginian* Territories, where such who acted contrary to their profession or subscription, were sharply sentenced. And in the Con-

Conc. Nicen. c. 8.

Conc. Carth. c. 93. Conc. Carth. 2. Can. 13.

ſtitutions of *Juſtinian*, according to ſome Copies, he who was to be ordained Biſhop, beſides his *ſubſcribing* to the doctrine of the Faith, and his *Oath* againſt *Simony*, was required to read the offices of the Church, for the holy Communion, and with the other Prayers of the Church, thoſe alſo appointed for Baptiſm. And he who (as he was required) did teſtifie his allowance of theſe Prayers by reading them, might as well have teſtified the ſame, by any other vocal acknowledgment or ſubſcription.

Novel. 123. *edit. Haloand.*

3. Among the *Proteſtants*, the practice of ſubſcription to ſuch things (as alſo that which is more ſolemn, an *acknowledgment by Oath*) hath been frequently admitted. In *Poland*, after the *conſent* (chiefly touching the Lords Supper) was eſtabliſhed in the Synod of *Sandomir*, 1570. between the Churches of thoſe three Confeſſions, the *Bohemian*, *Auguſtan*, and *Helvetian*; it was concluded in another following General Synod, and atteſted by the Super-Intendents, Miniſters and Patrons of the ſeveral Confeſſions, that none ſhould be admitted into the Miniſtry, or received into their Churches as a Miniſter, unleſs (among other qualifications) *conſenſui ſubſcribat*, he ſubſcribe to the conſent, and behave himſelf

Syn. Torun. 1585.

himſelf accordingly. Which proviſion contained a prudential care, that a due *decorum* ſhould be kept, even in the *Agenda* of Religion. The *French Church* requireth a ſubſcription to their Liturgy; and the like may be obſerved in divers other places.

4. In the *Bohemian* Church, after the time of their ordination, which was performed, *manuum Epiſcopalium impoſitione*, the Miniſters were ſolemnly admitted to their particular miniſtration by their Viſitor, who among other things, committed to them their *Liber Ritualis*, containing their form and rites of worſhip, of the performance of which they were to take care, and to which among other offices of their Miniſtry, they did at their Ordination oblige themſelves by a *Religious Oath*, both to God and his Church. They who entred into the Miniſtry at *Strasburgh*, after its firſt reformation, did by *Oath* undertake to keep in the Communion, and obedience of the Church and its Governours, according to the law of God, and their Canons, Statutes, and Ordinances. And it is related from the laws of *Geneva* (where an eſtabliſhed Liturgy is one of their Conſtitutions) that all they who were there received to the Miniſtry, muſt oblige them-

Ratio Diſcipl. c. 2. Sect. 4. & 5. p. 32, 34.

Ratio Canon. Examin. in Bucer. Script. Angl.

themſelves by *Oath*, to obſerve the Eccleſiaſtical Ordinances, ordained by the Councils of that City. In the *Hungarian* reformed Church, they who enter the Miniſtry, do by a very *ſolemn Oath* oblige themſelves, to the obſervations of the Eccleſiaſtical Canons, and to the performing due obedience to the Biſhop, and other Superiours in the Church, as may be ſeen in their Oath, as it is fully exhibited by Mr. *Durell*, from their Synodical Conſtitutions.

Eccleſ. Angl. Vindic. cap. 31. in fin.

5. The Subſcriptions or Declarations required amongſt us (beſides what for the preſent concerneth the Covenant) are, an acknowledgment of the *Kings juſt authority*, to ſecure the Government; of the *Articles of Religion*, to preſerve truth of Doctrine; and of the *Liturgie* and Book of *Ordination*, to maintain order and Uniformity: to which end alſo tendeth the Oath of Canonical obedience, wherein ſuch obedience to the Biſhop and his Succeſſours is engaged in all lawful and honeſt things: which muſt needs be blameleſs, unleſs it could be accounted a ſin, to reſolve to do good and honeſt things, in a way of order. Of theſe, I ſhall in this diſcourſe treat of what concerneth the *Liturgy*, which is chiefly oppugned; and therefore requireth the principal

principal conſideration, for the vindicating our Communion in the worſhip of God, and the manifeſting the unlawfulneſs of the breach thereof.

6. Some declared allowance of the Liturgy, hath ſince the reformation been ordinarily required in this Church. The *Articles* in the time of King *Edward* the Sixth, contained an approbation both of the Book of Common Prayer, and of Ordination. In Queen *Elizabeths* time, the allowance of the uſe, and the Subſcription to the Book of Common Prayer, was required by the *Adverti ſements*, and *Canons*, and defended by Biſhop *Whitgift*. Since Queen *Elizabeth*, the ſame hath been performed in the *Subſcription* according to the 36*th* Canon, and in the *Declaration and Acknowledgment*, in the Act of Uniformity, which in ſenſe much agreeth therewith.

Art. 35.

Adverti ſm. 7. *Eliz. Can.* 1571. *c. concionatores. Tract.* 21. *c.* 1.

7. The Subſcription required by the thirty ſixth Canon, is grounded upon the Conſtitutions of the Convocation, confirmed by the authority of the *Kings broad Seal*, according to his ſupream authority in cauſes Eccleſiaſtical, and according to the Statute, 25 *Henr.* 8. And ſo the Canons of the Church did of old frequently receive a confirmation, by the Emperours ſanction under his Seal; which

is

is a thing of ſo great antiquity, that *Euſebius* relateth concerning *Conſtantine*, the firſt Chriſtian Emperour, ἐπεσφραγίζετο τὰς τῶν ἐπισκόπων ὅρους, *that by his Seal, he ratified the determinations made by the Biſhops in their Synods.*

Euſ. de Vit. Conſt. l. 4. c. 27.

8. That Article in this Canon, which referreth to the Book of Common-Prayer, doth enclude an acknowledging three things. Firſt, *that that Book containeth nothing contrary to the word of God*: which is intended to be manifeſted in the following Chapters, touching the things chiefly oppoſed. The ſecond will be conſequent thereupon, viz. *that it may lawfully be ſo uſed.* The third and laſt clauſe, is a promiſe to *uſe the form preſcribed in that Book, in publick Prayer and adminiſtration of the Sacraments, and none other*: the lawfulneſs of which promiſe, doth evidently follow from the former clauſe, and its ſenſe is of the ſame import, with thoſe words of the acknowledgment, required in the Act of Uniformity, viz. *I will conform to the Liturgie of the Church of* England, *as it is now eſtabliſhed.*

9. But ſome eſpecial doubts have been peculiarly entertained, concerning the ſenſe of the Declaration in the Act of Uniformity, in giving *unfeigned aſſent and*

conſent,

conſent, to all and every thing, contained and preſcribed, in and by the Book of Common-Prayer, &c. But while our Government doth require the uſe of this form, both the intended ſenſe (being the ſame with that of the two former clauſes concerning the Liturgy, in the Canon abovementioned) and the expreſſion thereof, may upon equitable and impartial conſideration, appear clearly and fairly juſtifiable. To which purpoſe, the true ſenſe of *aſſenting and conſenting*, and the things to which this hath reſpect, is to be enquired after.

10. Wherefore it is firſt to be conſidered, that as to *aſſent*, when referred to things aſſerted, is to owne the truth of them; ſo when referred to things to be done, ordered or uſed, it is to allow that they ſhould be put in practice: in which latter ſenſe, *aſſenting* is one and the ſame with *conſenting*. Now the Act of Uniformity, both immediately before this Declaration, and in divers other places, referreth this unfeigned aſſent and conſent, to *the uſe* of the things in that Book *contained and preſcribed*; and thereby directeth us to this ordinary ſenſe of the word *Aſſent*: as doth alſo the nature of the things to be aſſented to, which for the main part are Prayers, Thankſgivings,

givings, and Rubricks, which being no aſſertions or propoſitions, are to be *uſed*, but not properly to be *believed*. This notion of *aſſenting* in the ſame ſignification with *conſenting*, according to the frequent uſe of *aſſenſus* in the Latin (as when things are agreed *unanimi aſſenſu & conſenſu*, and the marriage of Children is declared, that it ſhould be *de aſſenſu & conſenſu parentum*; and we read of *dower de aſſenſu patris*, in our Engliſh Law-Books) and the ſame might be evidenced by various Engliſh Examples. But this Declaration being required by our Statute Laws, it may be ſufficient to obſerve, that this is a very common ſenſe of the word *aſſent*, in our Engliſh Statutes.

Littleton C. of Tenaunt in Dower.

11. Thus from King *Edw.* I. till King *Henry* the ſeventh (and ſometimes after) our Statute Laws are oft declared to be *aſſented unto*; or to be made with the aſſent of the Lords, *&c.* But from Queen *Elizabeths* time downwards, the Laws are oft expreſſed to be enacted by the King or Queen, with the *conſent* of the Lords, *&c.* and ſometimes with their *aſſent and conſent*, (as 1 *Jac.* 2. & 21 *Jac.* 2.) In the ſame ſenſe *par aſſent*, *aſſenſus*, and ſuch like expreſſions, are frequently uſed in our moſt ancient Statutes, in their Latin

25 Ed. 1. c. 1. Pref. to 18 Ed. 3. & to 2 Ric. 2. & paſſim.

Latin and French Originals. As in *St. de Carl. Ordinat. Foreſt. c. 6. St. Lincoln. Weſtm.* 4. *Exilium Hug. le deſpenſer. Ordin. pro ter. Hib.* And about common affairs, the word *aſſent* is three times in one paragraph uſed in this ſenſe, concerning the recovery of any land, *by the aſſent and agreement of the perſons*, to whom the reverſion ſhall appertain. Nor doth the uſing theſe two words of *aſſent and conſent*, in the ſame clauſe, require ſuch a ſenſe of this Declaration, in which they muſt differ from each other: ſince variety of words even in the moſt ſolemn acknowledgments, is oft uſed, not to expreſs the difference, but to determine the certainty of ſenſe; according to that Rule, *Quæ dubitationis tollendæ cauſa inſeruntur, jus commune non lædunt.* Thus in the Oath of Obedience or Allegiance, I *A. B.* do *truly* and *ſincerely*, *acknowledge*, *profeſs*, *teſtifie*, and *declare*, that our Sovereign Lord is *lawful* and *rightful* King,---Where all theſe words connected by conjunctive Particles, do only ſerve more expreſly to manifeſt the ſame thing. 14 Eliz. 8. Ex Reg. Juris.

12. And ſince the conſideration both of perſons and time make it evident, that this aſſent to be given, cannot contribute any thing, to the authoritative ordering

ordering and conſtitution of theſe things, (which were before eſtabliſhed by authority) its moſt proper and natural ſenſe, muſt import a conſent to, or *allowing of the uſe* of theſe things, which is the ſenſe, unto which the expreſſions in the Act of Uniformity, do alſo plainly direct. Wherefore ſuch things only as are to be uſed (being both contained and preſcribed) as all the Prayers, Hymns, directing Rubricks, Kalendar, and the whole frame of the Liturgy, come within the compaſs of this Declaration. But ſome things occaſionally declared, and not preſcribed, are not contained under it. For inſtance, theſe words, that *this Book as it ſtood before eſtabliſhed by law, did not contain in it any thing, which a godly man may not with a good Conſcience uſe and ſubmit to*; though they be true and conſiderable, yet if they were encluded under this declaration, then even ſuch things as were thought fit to be altered, muſt be ſtill in ſome ſort aſſented unto; which is both contrary to the end of ſuch alterations, and to the proper ſenſe of the words of this Declaration.

In the Preface.

13. And even ſuch perſons who conceive ſome things or expreſſions preſcribed, either in the Phraſes of *Common-Prayer*

Prayer it ſelf, or in the *pointing* of the Pſalms, or in the *Tranſlation* of the Pſalms or other Scriptures; not to be ſuitable to their own deſires or apprehenſions (yet to be free from ſin, and of ſuch a nature, as that the whole remaineth uſeful, to guide the exerciſes of Piety) thoſe perſons may ſafely and with a good Conſcience, make this Declaration of *aſſent*, with reſpect unto other weighty conſiderations, of ſubmiſſion to Authority, promoting Peace, Order, and Unity, and the edification of the Church, in the united exerciſe of a right religious worſhip. Even as ſuch learned men, who may judge even our laſt *tranſlation of the Bible*, not to have fitly expreſſed the ſenſe of ſome difficult places, may yet both unfeignedly aſſent, and earneſtly perſwade to the diligent uſe thereof, as knowing it to be of excellent advantage, to the pious and humble Readers, for their profitable learning the Goſpel Doctrine, and the will of God.

14. Wherefore by this Declaration is given ſuch an open vocal approbation of this Book, required by Law, as agreeth in ſenſe with the ſubſcription enjoined by Canon. And the intent thereof is, to expreſs ſuch an unfeigned allowance or conſent, to all things contained and preſcribed

ſcribed in the Book of Common-Prayer, with the Pſalms, as that they may *warrantably and with a good Conſcience be uſed*, as they are eſtabliſhed by authority: the truth of which will appear more manifeſt upon a particular enquiry.

CHAP.

CHAP. IV.

Of the Liturgy and the ordinary ſervice appointed therein.

SECT. I.

The lawfulneſs, antiquity, and expediency of publick forms.

1. *Publick Prayer* is acknowledged by all Chriſtians, to be a chief part of the worſhip of God, who hath ſaid, *My houſe ſhall be called an houſe of Prayer for all people.* But ſince God hath not expreſly declared in his word, whether the ordinary publick duties of Chriſtian Prayer, ſhould be performed with or without a form, the determination of the fitteſt practice in this caſe muſt be made (not without regard to the authority of *Governours*) by a reſpect to the rules of *order*, *edification*, and the *glory of God*, and an eye unto approved examples, from which conſiderations, I ſhall produce divers evidences, of the requiſiteneſs of a ſet form for the publick offices of the Church, both from *Reaſon*, and from *example* and authority.

2. The reaſons are ſuch as theſe. 1. That hereby a fit, true, right, and well *ordered way of worſhip*, in addreſſes to God, may be beſt ſecured to the Church, in its publick ſervice of God, that neither God nor his worſhip may be diſhonoured; there being many eaſily diſcernable ways, of conſiderable miſcarriage, in the publick offices of the Church, even by them who err not in the doctrines of Religion, 2. That needful *comprehenſive petitions*, for all common and ordinary ſpiritual and outward wants, of our ſelves or others, with fit thankſgivings, may not in the publick ſupplications of the Church be omitted; which (conſidering men as they are) can no other way be either ſo well or at all aſſured. 3. That the *affections and hearts* of pious and religious men may be more *devout*, and better *united* in their preſenting their ſervice to God, where they may conſider beforehand, what particular Prayers and Thankſgivings they are to offer up, and come the more ready and prepared to join in them. This is an advantage of which many are deprived by a bad temper of mind, either *ſucked* in by *prejudice*, or *ſwallowed down* by *carleſneſs*.

3. 4. That ſuch *difficult parts of Church Offices*, as *Baptiſm* and the *Lords Supper*, the

the matter of which requireth great conſideration, that they may be clearly and aright expreſſed, (as both *Conformiſts*, and many *Non-Conformiſts* acknowledge, and is evident from the many diſputes about them, by men neither of mean parts, nor dangerous deſigns) may by a more *conſiderate* care in the compoſure of a *form*, be ſo framed, that men of greateſt underſtandings may with readieſt aſſent entertain them, and that they may be ſufficiently vindicated againſt the boldeſt oppoſers. 5. To be an *evidence* to *other Churches and future times*, after what way and manner we worſhip God, and that both the matter and expreſſion of our ſervice to him, is ſound and pious, in our general and common worſhip. And this may be a full teſtimony that ſuch a Church both receiving the true faith, and expreſſing a right way of worſhip, is both a *true* and in its meaſure a *pure* and *incorrupt Church*.

4. The Arguments from *example*, which in general countenance the lawfulneſs or expedieney of a form, are two, which will require a larger Declaration. The firſt is from the *practice and example of Chriſt*, who directed his Diſciples the uſe of the *Lords Prayer*, as a ſet form: and that from thence the cuſtom of the

De Eccleſ. Offic. l. 1. c. 9. Chriſtian Church, in compoſing and uſing ſet forms did take its pattern, is reaſonably aſſerted by *Iſidorus Hiſpalenſis*. That the *Lords Prayer* was delivered as a form is ſo manifeſt; that (were it not for the violent force offered to mens minds, by prejudice and contentious oppoſition) it could never have been queſtioned. And it may be ſufficiently proved, 1. From the command given by our Saviour, *Luk.* 11. 2. *When ye pray, ſay Our Father, &c.* and the expreſſion in S. *Matthew*, *Mat.* 6. 9. Οὕτως προσεύχεσθε *pray ſo or on this manner*, is the ſame with that, when the form of Aaronical benediction was enjoined, *Numb.* 6. 23. *On this wiſe* (in the Septuagint Οὕτως) *ſhall ye bleſs*. But the bleſſing there directed hath been generally acknowledged, to be a conſtant invariable *form of Benediction* under the law, and as ſuch was uſed in the German Reformation by *Luther*, and in that alſo of *Geneva*. 2. From the ground of the *Diſciples requeſt*, *Luk.* 11. 1. *Lord, teach us to pray as* John *alſo taught his Diſciples*. That it was ordinary for the Jewiſh Teachers to compoſe forms for their Diſciples is obſerved by Dr. *Lightfoot*, on *Mat.* 6. 9. and the frequent yea conſtant uſe of forms in the Jewiſh Church ſhall be hereafter manifeſted, and if this be referred

Luth. Tom. 3. f. 10. Prec. Eccleſ. Form. Genev.

ferred to the words of S. *Luke* now mentioned, it is not to be doubted, but that *John* the Baptiſt, according to the cuſtom of the Jews, delivered a form of Prayer to his Diſciples, and that what *John* did herein, was both approved, and the like practiſed by our Saviour, who directed the uſe of the *Lords Prayer*, to his Diſciples at two different times.

5. 3. From the manner of the *compoſure of the Lords Prayer*, which is not propounded as a general direction to pray, that Gods name may be hallowed, and that his Kingdom ſhould come; but it is dictated by Chriſt as it ſhould be expreſſed by us in our perſons, *Our Father, hallowed be thy name, &c.* 4. The ancient *Chriſtian Church* near the times of *Chriſt*, did acknowledge and uſe it as a *form*. S. *Cyprian* is very large to this purpoſe; ſaith he, *Chriſt conſulting the ſalvation of his people, etiam orandi formam ipſe dedit, himſelf delivered them a form of prayer*; and then exhorteth that we *pray as our maſter taught us, that the father when we pray may owne the words of his Son*; and ſaith he, *when we have Chriſt an advocate, let us expreſs the words of our advocate*; and *how much more effectually ſhall we obtain what we ask in Chriſts name, if we ask by his Prayer?* *Tertullian* before

Cyp. de Orat. Domin.

Tertul. de Orat. c. 1. & c. 9. him declared, *Christus novam orationis formam determinavit, Christ appointed a new form of prayer*, and he saith, that whilst the Christians used other Prayers this was not omitted, *præmissa legitima & ordinaria oratione quasi fundamento.*

Lucian. in Philopat. And before both these the words of *Lucian* in *Trajan's* time, about reciting the Prayer beginning ἀπὸ τῶ πατρὸς, doth intimate the ordinary use of this Prayer among Christians. From these testimonies I suppose it evident, that the *Lords Prayer* was used as a form in the ancient Christian Assemblies, and that we have good reason thus far to receive, what some hundred years after was delivered by S. *Gregory*, and from him by divers other Writers, that the *Apostles themselves did always at the Consecration of the Eucharist, make use of the Lords Prayer.* Wherefore the Lords Prayer being thus delivered as a form, doth enclude an approbation of the like composures of Prayers among the *Jews*, and an allowance of the same among *Christians*, for whom this was intended. And that path where we follow our Saviours steps cannot be the way of errour.

Gr. Ep. l. 7. c. 63.

6. The other argument from example, is from the ordinary *practice of the Church both Jewish and Christian.* Concerning

cerning the Jewiſh Church, I might inſtance in the eighteen Prayers, compoſed for its ordinary uſe from the time of the Captivity, which are oft mentioned by the Jewiſh Writers, and in their forms of Prayer for the Paſsover, of which *Scaliger* thinketh that there is as much reaſon to be confident, *that the particular Prayers recorded in the Talmud* (which he calleth their Digeſts) *were the ancient forms uſed by the Jews, as that the Roman Digeſts exhibit to us the true determination of the Roman Lawyers.* But I ſhall rather inſiſt on the Jewiſh Church making uſe of ſet forms of Prayer, from the very times of *Moſes*, and ſo downwards; which is no new opinion but is ordinarily received; and it hath been obſerved by divers learned men, that the *Samaritan Chronicle* ſpeaketh of a *Book of Prayers, uſed by the Jews at their Sacrifices, from the time of their Legate* Moſes, *until that day.* And beſides the teſtimony of that Author (which I urge no further than other proof may be made) let theſe two things be conſidered.

De Emendat. Tempor. l. 6. p. 573.

7. Firſt, That it is certain from the Scriptures (and oft expreſſed by *Philo Judæus*) that the Jews did uſe Prayers with their Sacrifices and oblations. *The whole multitude were praying without at*

the time of incenſe, *Luk.* 1. 10. and the Apoſtles themſelves went up to the Temple, *at the hour of Prayer which was the ninth hour*, *Act.* 3. 1. Which was the time of the evening Sacrifice; and M. *Mede* hath well proved that Sacrifice it ſelf is a rite of ſupplication. And that the uſe of ſuch Prayers was as ancient as *Moſes*, is manifeſt from *Lev.* 16. 21. Where *Aaron* was commanded *to confeſs over the live Goat, the iniquities of the Children of Iſrael.* Secondly, That there are plain evidences in the Old Teſtament, of ſuch forms uſed upon many occaſions. Beſides the forms of Prayers and praiſes in the Book of *Pſalms*, enjoined for conſtant uſe unto the *Levites* by *Hezekiah*, and the Princes, 2 *Chr.* 29, 30. and beſides divers other Hymns and Songs, and ſuch commands for a form of words, as *Joel* 2. 17. *Hoſ.* 14. 2. there is an *expreſs form of Prayer* appointed by God, to be uſed at the Offering the Heifer for expiation of uncertain murder, *Deut.* 21. 8. and a *form of confeſſion* at the offering up their firſt fruits, *Deut.* 26. 3, 4, 5, 6, 7. and a form of *Prayer at the preſenting* the third years Tithe, *Deut.* 26. 13, 14, *&c.* and ſome other ſuch like. Whence it is evident, that forms of Prayer were by *Gods appointment* uſed, from the beginning of the Jewiſh

Mr. *Mede Diſ. on Ezr.* 6. 10.

Jewiſh Church. Yet if no ſuch thing could have been proved, and if their original had been from *John the Baptiſt*, and the direction of our *Saviour*, this alone might be ſufficient to recommend them unto Chriſtians.

8. In conſidering the general practice of the *Chriſtian Church*, it muſt be acknowledged, that in that extraordinary caſe (which reacheth not the ordinary condition of the Church) when the miraculous gifts of the Holy Ghoſt were communicated; both *Prayer*, *Propheſying and ſinging* were frequently thereby performed, as is evident from 1 *Cor.* 14. And I yield it moſt probable (though even Proteſtant Writers do herein differ) that the ancient *Roman*, *Jeruſalem*, and *Alexandrian Offices*, were called the *Liturgies of* S. *Peter*, S. *James* and S. *Mark*, becauſe of their certain early uſe in the Churches where they preſided; though it is not certain that they were compoſed by them, this being mentioned by no ancient Writer of the firſt Centuries. Nor do I doubt but the *Liturgy or Anaphora of* S. *John*, and that of the twelve Apoſtles are ſuppoſititious, which with the former are related by *Gabriel Sionita*, to be exhibited amongſt the *Syriack Offices*: for of theſe we have no mention in any ancient

Gab. Sionit. de Ritib. Maron.

ancient Eccleſiaſtical Writer, unleſs the words of *Epiphanius*, expreſſing all the *Apoſtles* with S. *James* the Brother of our Lord, to be Μυσηίων ἀρχηγέλαι (that is, *chief Diſpenſers or Stewards of the Chriſtian Myſteries*) might allowably be racked, to ſpeak them all *Compoſers of Liturgical forms*, according to the violence offered to thoſe words by *Leo Allatius*. But if it can yet be proved, that at leaſt ſince the ceaſing of the frequent diſtribution of the miraculous gifts of the Spirit, the Church of Chriſt hath in all Ages uſed and approved forms, this will be as conſiderable a teſtimony in behalf of *Liturgies*, as can reaſonably be required.

Epiph. Her. 79.

Allatius de Liturg. S. Jacob.

9. That *Forms of Prayer* were of uſe in the Church, about 1300. years ſince, is acknowleged by them who plead moſt againſt them, from *Conc. Laod. c.* 18. 3. *Carth. c.* 23. *and Conc. Mil. c.* 12. and that they have continued from that time downward, cannot be denied. In the *fourth Century*, there is frequent mention of ſome parcels of Liturgy, in the Writings of the Fathers: and there are ſo many teſtimonies that S. *Chryſoſtom*, S. *Ambroſe*, and S. *Baſil* were framers of Liturgies, that I do not ſee how any can rationally doubt of the truth thereof. But

But that theſe Liturgies have undergone divers alterations in ſucceeding Ages, is both apparent, and is very reaſonable to be imagined. And he who ſhall compare the *Greek* Copy of S. *Baſils Liturgy*, with the *Syriack* or its verſion, both which are repreſented together by *Caſſander*, will find them ſo vaſtly different from each other, that he muſt either conclude great alterations to have paſſed upon them, or that they never were originally the ſame. But from theſe I ſhall now look back, into the *more early times of the Chriſtian Church*, where for the moſt part, I ſhall only briefly mention the teſtimonies, which have been fully produced by others. *Caſſand. Liturgic.*

10. It is not probable, that *Conſtantine* the Emperour would have compoſed εὐχὰς εὐσεβεῖς, *godly Prayers, for the uſe of his Souldiers*, if ſuch forms had not then been uſed in the Chriſtian Church: *Euſebius* accounting this an *admirable thing*, that the Emperour ſhould be λόγων εὐκλυείων διδάσκαλος, *a teacher of the words of Prayer.* But *Euſebius* in another place, giving a particular account of ſome expreſſions ſuited to the Souldiery, in thoſe ſet forms of Prayer, which he calleth εὐχὰς ἐνθέσμους *the conſtituted Prayers*; doth a little before that declare *Conſtantines* own practice, *Euſeb. de Laud. Conſtant. ante med.* *De Vit. Conſt. l. 4. c. 19, 20.*

c. 17. dice, that he would *take Books into his hands, either for contemplating the holy Scriptures, or for the expreſſing with his Court* τὰς εὐχὰς ἐνθέσμους, *the Prayers that were conſtituted and appointed:* and this *Euſebius* there calleth his ordering his Court ἐκκλησίας θεῷ τρόπον, *according to the manner of the Church of God*: and this is a manifeſt evidence of forms in the Chriſtian Church in his time. *Origen* manifeſtly citeth a piece of the uſual Liturgy, an hundred years before *Conſtantine*, ſaying, *Frequenter in oratione dicimus Da omnipotens, da nobis partem cum prophetis, &c. We frequently ſay in our Prayers, Give, O Almighty God, give us a part with the Prophets, &c.* and in his Books againſt *Celſus* he declareth Chriſtians to uſe προσκεχθείσαις εὐχαῖς *Prayers which were ordained or conſtituted.* S. *Cyprian* ſufficiently intimateth the uſe of ſome forms in the *Carthaginian* ſervice in his time, by deſcribing the entrance or beginning thereof, the Prieſt ſaying *ſurſum corda, lift up your hearts*; and the people anſwering *Habemus ad Dominum, We liſt them up unto the Lord.* And he that conſidereth, that *Tertullian* plainly intimateth a form of *abrenunciation* in Baptiſm, *De Cor. Mil. c.* 3. and that they had *ſet Hymns* then appointed for particular times and hours, upon their ſtationary

Orig. Hom. 11. in Jerem.

Cont. Celſum, l. 6.

Cyp. de Orat. Dom.

ſtationary days, as *Albaſpinus* interpreteth him, *Adv. Pſych. c.* 13. will think it not improbable, that what he mentioneth of the particular heads of Prayer, in the uſual Aſſemblies of the Chriſtians, ſhould have reference to ſome *conſtant forms* by them uſed: and their uſe is favoured by the expreſſions of εὐχὴ κοινὴ and δέησις κοινὴ in *Juſtin Martyr* and *Ignatius*. And many have thought, that the Apoſtle had a ſpecial eye to the compoſure of ſuch forms of Prayer, agreeably to what the Baptiſt and our Saviour preſcribed to their Diſciples, in commanding *Timothy* the Governour of the Church, that (among the things which concerned his *behaviour in the Church of God, Ch.*3.15.) *firſt of all, prayers, interceſſions, ſupplications, and giving of thanks, be made for all men, &c.* For though the Phraſe ποιεῖσθαι δεήσεις may either ſignifie that *Prayers be put up to God*, or that they be *compoſed*, in this place it may well intend both. And it is thought by S. *Auguſtine*, that theſe various words of the Apoſtle, *Prayers, Supplications, Interceſſions, and giving of thanks*, did direct to a comprehenſive fulneſs of all ſuch Prayers, in the fixed models of the publick ſervice of the Church, when the Communion was adminiſtred, and that the publick offices

Albaſp. obſerv. l. 1. *c.* 16.

Tert. Ap. c. 39.

V. Dr. *Hammond in* 1 *Tim.* 2. 1.

Aug. Ep. 59.

of

De Vocat. Gentium, l. 1. c. 4. of the Church were accordingly composed, and the same sense is also favoured by *Prosper.*

11. Since the reformation, the *Saxon* and *other Lutheran Churches* have their *Liturgies*, the *Bohemian* had its *Liber Rituali*s and the *Palatinate* its *Agenda* (as *Ursin.* stileth it) by which the right order of its publick administrations, *might be vindicated from the Calumnies of detractors.* And the Churches of *France*, *Holland*, and others, have their forms for the publick service of God. And after the Order at *Geneva* had established a form of publick service for the Lords day, with some appearance of a liberty of varation (which some relate not to have been so manifest in their practice, as in their rule; which was *Dominico die mane hæc utplurimum adhibetur formula*) I say after this was established at *Geneva*, *Calvin* who composed it expressed his judgment to be for the strict use of set forms, in his Letter to the Lord Protector in *England*: Wherein he writeth to this purpose. *For so much as concerneth the form of Prayers and Ecclesiastical rites, valde probo, I much approve, that it be determined, so that it may not be lawful for the Ministers in their administrations, to vary from it.* And this he judgeth necessary

Ursin. Præf. in Apolog. Catechis.

Calv. Ep. 87.

ceſſary for theſe reaſons, that it may be an *help to the weakneſs of ſome*, that it may be a *teſtimony of the Churches conſent*, and that it may *ſtop the deſultorious levity* of thoſe who are for new things.

12. And theſe very expreſſions of *Calvin*, are cited with great approbation by the *Walachrian Claſſis of Zealand*, in what they wrote in the time of our late Wars, to the *Aſſembly at London*, and they further declare their great diſtaſt againſt them, who condemn the uſe of forms, in theſe words; *Durum putamus omnes illas pias Eccleſias condemnare, quæ ab Apoſtolicis & primitivæ Eccleſiæ temporibus, uſq; ad hodiernum diem, cultum Dei publicum ex præſcriptis certiſque formulis celebrarunt,--proinde hominum illorum præciſam ſingularitatem arguimus, qui omnes præſcriptas formulas ex cultu divino eliminant.* Say they, *We account it grievous, to condemn all thoſe holy Churches, which from the Apoſtolical times, and the primitive Church, unto this day, have celebrated the publick worſhip of God out of preſcribed forms,---Wherefore we blame the preciſe ſingularity of thoſe men, who would caſt out all preſcribed forms from divine worſhip:* So they. And indeed it muſt be a raſh ſentence to condemn forms of Prayer as evil and ſinful, which were embraced by the *ancient*

Conſid. Contr. in Angl. c. 7. qu. 2.

ancient Church, while it retained its ſoundneſs, and before the corruptions and diſtempers of the Church of *Rome* took place, and by the Proteſtant Churches ſince their recovery therefrom. And in the determining what is expedient, or inexpedient, he had need have ſtrong foundations to erect his high confidence upon, who will oppoſe his own judgment, with ſome very few perſons beſides, againſt the *concurrent judgment and practice* of the Church of Chriſt, in ſo many ſeveral Ages and Nations, and againſt the determination of *God* himſelf under the *Old Teſtament*, and our bleſſed *Saviour* under the *New*.

SECT. II.

Objections againſt ſet forms anſwered.

1. What is oppoſed againſt the former Section, muſt be here conſidered, both concerning the *antiquity*, *lawfulneſs*, *and expediency* of ſet forms. It is acknowledged, that publick Prayer even at the Celebration of the Holy Communion, was at the beginning of Chriſtianity, performed by the extraordinary and wonderful effuſion of the gifts of the Holy Ghoſt, when alſo propheſying and ſinging

ſinging were performed by the ſame. But ſome attempt hath been made to prove that there was no *ordinary uſe of forms of Prayer* in the three firſt Centuries, and that they were not eſtabliſhed till the end of the *fourth Century*.

2. To this purpoſe *Juſtin Martyr* is firſt produced, who declareth concerning his time, that at the Communion Προεστὼς εὐχὰς ὁμοίως καὶ εὐχαριστίας ὅση δύναμις αὐτῷ ἀναπέμπει: *the chief Miniſter ſendeth forth Prayers and Thanksgivings according to his ability*, or rather, *with all his might*. Now all the proof here dependeth on the uſe of the Phraſe ὅση δύναμις, which the Objectors underſtand, *according to his ability in compoſing a Prayer*. But this is a ſenſe not conſiſtent with the uſe of the ſame Phraſe in another place of the ſame Apology, where he diſcourſeth alſo of their Prayers at the Euchariſt, and ſpeaketh of all Chriſtians (who were not all to compoſe Prayers according to their ability for that ſervice) that they were ὅση δύναμις αἰνοῦντες *praiſing God with Prayers and Thanksgivings with all their might*; that is, with the greateſt intention and fervency of heart and ſpirit; and this is properly the ſenſe of ὅση δύναμις as may be evinced from the uſe thereof in other places, and from the uſe of

Apol. 2. prope fin. p. 98.

P. 60.

like expreſſions referring to Prayer.

Naz. Orat. 3. 3. It was *Nazianzens* exhortation, *Let us being cleanſed in ſoul and body* ὅσῃ δύναμις ἄδωμεν ἐκείνῳ ᾠδὴν *with all our might ſing that ſong, which the Iſraelites ſung when the Egyptians were deſtroyed*; where the ὅσῃ δύναμις implies affectionateneſs and earneſtneſs of mind in the uſe of a ſet form of words. *Buxtorf* noteth it as an expreſſion uſed among the Jews, that he who *ſhall ſay Amen* בכל כחו *with all his might* (which anſwered to ὅσῃ δύναμις) *the Gates of Paradiſe ſhall be opened to him*: but here could be no variety of expreſſion, but (as he enterpreteth it) by this Phraſe is meant, *omni intentione & devotione, a joining with all earneſtneſs of intention & heartineſs of devotion.* About 450. years ſince was framed an *Engliſh Canon*, requiring the daily publick Prayers and ſervice to be performed religiouſly, *prout Deus dederit*, and again, *prout Deus inſpiraverit* (which are Phraſes as plauſible and pregnant as ὅσῃ δύναμις) and yet theſe Phraſes were uſed concerning the *ſet diurnal and nocturnal offices*, requiring that they ſhould behave themſelves therein with *Religious devoutneſs, according as God ſhould give them ability, and breath by his ſpirit.* Wherefore this citation from *Juſtin Martyr*, though managed

Lex. Rab. in אמן.

Linw. Prov. l. 3. Tit. 23. Sect. 1.

naged ἐν δύναμις, or *with the utmoſt might*, will prove nothing but the *weakneſs of the attempt of the undertakers.*

4. Another place objected is from *Tertullian*, who ſaith the Chriſtians did pray, *ſine monitore quia de pectore, without a monitor or prompter, becauſe from their heart.* The ſenſe of theſe words of *Tertullian* hath been variouſly apprehended by divers learned men; ſome judging that they intend *praying by heart* (as we call it) and therefore by a form; others that they expreſſed the readineſs of Chriſtians to put up *hearty and devout ſupplications* to God, from the Religious inclinations of their own ſpirits; and ſome very worthy men have thought that ſenſe of theſe words, which is cloſed with in the management of this objection, not to be improbable concerning *Tertullians* time. And it is not much to be wondred, if ſome obſcure Phraſes of ſo dark a Writer as *Tertullian* be either not well underſtood, or ſometimes miſunderſtood; among this number I account this Phraſe, which I ſuppoſe to refer to an ancient cuſtom in the *Primitive Church.* But *Apol.* c. 30. *Biſhop Bilſon, of Chriſtian ſubjection. Part.* 4.

5. In anſwer to this objection, it might be ſufficient to obſerve, that *ſine monitore*, can in no propriety of ſpeech be conſtrued, *without a form*; ſince the

Monitor muſt needs be a perſon not a Book, whoſe words were to guide and direct others. Now I ſuppoſe they who object this place, would not from hence infer, that in the *Publick Prayers of the Church*, there was *no Miniſter* who expreſſed the words of Prayer, with which the reſt joined in affection. This is indeed moſt properly to pray *ſine monitore*, but this could not be practiſed in publick Prayers, ſave only in the uſe of a *known form*, in which they ſhould all *conſpire* with *one heart and voice*: and according to this ſenſe (in which it is moſt fairly underſtood, if it be referred to the publick Prayers of the Church) this place is a conſiderable teſtimony for the uſe of ſet forms.

9. But it ſeemeth to me very probable (which I leave to the conſideration of others) that theſe words peculiarly concern the *Stationary days* of the ancient Church. Theſe days were the fourth and ſixth days of the Week, in which the Chriſtians attended the publick Aſ-
Albaſp. Obſ. l. 1. obſ. 16. ſemblies of the Church, beginning very early in the Morning, and continuing till three a Clock in the Afternoon, and theſe were accounted the chief days of *Chriſtian ſupplication & humiliation*, and the obſervance of them was eſteemed the moſt

moſt effectual means, to obtain Gods bleſſing and favour. On theſe days, beſides their joining in publick Prayers which *Tertullian* intimated to be performed about the hours of *nine*, *twelve*, *and three*, a conſiderable portion of the days was alloted for their exerciſing themſelves in private Prayers, and inward and fervent ſupplications, humbly performed *upon their knees*, with faſting and tears *in the place of publick Aſſemblies*; with regard to what was needful either to themſelves in particular, or to the publick welfare of the Church or Empire. Of the ordinary uſe of theſe *retired*, *but ſolemn* ſupplications and devotions in the Chriſtian Church, there are (as I ſuppoſe) divers ſufficient teſtimonies.

7. *Tertullian* (who in his Book *De Oratione*, hath peculiar reſpect to their *Stationary* days) ſpeaketh hereof; *Quid amplius referunt iſti qui clarius adorant, niſi quod proximis obſtrepant? imo prodendo petitiones ſuas quid minus faciunt, quam ſi in publico orent?* And S. *Cyprian* required them who are gathered together in the Aſſemblies with the brethren, and do *celebrate divine Sacrifices with Gods Prieſt*, *that they would avoid indigeſted and tumultuous ſpeaking*, *and ſetteth*

De Orat. c. 13.

Cyp. de Orat. Dom. v. Pamel. in Cypriani. n. 7.

before them the example of Hannah, *who prayed not by loud petition, ſed tacite & modeſte, intra ipſas pectoris latebras precabatur.* That there were ſuch Prayers uſed in the *Jewiſh Church*, appeareth from the example of *Hannah*, and of the *Phariſee and Publican.* To underſtand this Phraſe of *Tertullian* concerning ſuch Prayers in the Chriſtian Churches, is moſt agreeable to the literal ſenſe of theſe words *ſine monitore quia de pectore*, and to *Zephyrus* thus paraphraſing upon it. *We do not conceive Prayers dictated by a Prieſt, but all the Chriſtian Aſſembly, as if we all conſpired together, do expreſs our deſires with ſighs and groans, out of the very ſeat of our minds and ſpirit.* So that he underſtandeth this place, of that inflamed devotion kindled from a fervency of inward heat, which needed not the help of the wind without to blow it up; or of thoſe active deſires which received not their efficacy from the breath or voice of another, but from the inward motions of the ſoul.

8. After theſe are produced, the Council of *Laodicea Can.* 18. 3. *Conc. Carth. c.* 23. and *Conc. Milev. c.* 12. as if they gave the original to ſet forms of Prayer, when they only eſtabliſhed ſome ſanctions concerning them. The *Laodicean Canon* enjoineth

enjoineth the uſe of theſe ſervices Morning and Evening. The Canon of *Carthage* in one part of it requireth that *quaſcunq; ſibi preces aliquis deſcribit, whatſoever Prayers any one ſhall tranſcribe for himſelf, he ſhall not uſe them till he hath conferred with the underſtanding brethren.* Now tranſcribing (properly here intended) ſuppoſeth a form, and care is taken by this Canon, that no Copy for the publick uſe of the Church, (which could then be only had by tranſcribing) ſhould be received until it was carefully examined. The other part of that Canon requireth, that *at the Communion* (where Chriſts offering up himſelf to the Father is commemorated) *their Prayers ſhould always be directed to the Father.* This doth not ſuppoſe that there were no forms then in uſe, but might well be intended either to put a *ſtop* to what was then entring, or to *regulate* what was *amiſs* in any of their ſet forms, eſpecially conſidering that in the vaſt territories of the *Carthaginian juriſdiction*, various forms of Prayer were about that time uſed; ſome of which were compoſed by Hereticks, as is evident from S. *Auguſtin*, who was a member of that Council. The *Canon of Milevis* declareth againſt the uſe of any other forms, than thoſe eſta-

V. Medts Chriſtian Sacr. Sect. 3.

Cont. Don. l. 6. c. 25.

bliſhed by the Council: but we may as well conclude from our *Act of Uniformity*, as from any of theſe Councils, that it gave the firſt *Original to forms of Prayer*, becauſe they are thereby eſtabliſhed. And thus having viewed theſe chief objections, I may well conclude that the evidence for the *great antiquity of ſet forms* remaineth inviolable.

9. The argument againſt the *lawfulneſs* of ſet forms, becauſe they *limit the uſe of gifts*, needeth not much conſideration; ſince it is manifeſt, that by the will of God, bounds and limits were to be ſet even to the uſe of the *extraordinary gifts of Gods ſpirit*, that the Church might be edifyed, 1 *Cor.* 14. 26, 27, 28, 30, 33. Whereas now no ſuch miraculous *emanation of the Holy Ghoſt* can be pretended; nor doth the eſtabliſhing a form for the publick Office of the Church deny the liberty in due place of uſing other Prayers, according to the practice of our and the ancient Church.

10. It is further objected, that forms of Prayer are *diſadvantageous to piety* and *devotion*, and the Non-Conformiſts oft plead experience as a teſtimony, that they are the cauſe of much *deadneſs in mens ſpirits*, and the hindrance of the lively exerciſe of Religion. Here on

the

the other hand, others by experience aſſert the advantage of ſet forms to *promote devotion*, when attended without prejudice, and with a Religious deſign of joining in Gods worſhip. To diſcern the truth in this difference, it may be uſeful to conſult the judgment of ſuch perſons as are *leaſt partial* in this Caſe, and yet are able to make a true eſtimate of damage or advantage; and then eſpecially to conſider the *evidence of reaſon* which may be produced.

11. The *Leyden* Profeſſors declare concerning ſet forms, *non tantum licitas ſed & valde utiles eſſe contendimus*, *We defend againſt any perſons that they are not only lawful, but exceedingly advantageous*, and this they aſſert *not only becauſe every Chriſtian cannot fitly conceive new Prayers upon every occaſion, but becauſe in great Aſſemblies, attentio auditorum per uſitatas formulas non parum juvatur, the attentiveneſs of the hearers is not a little helped forward by uſual forms.* The *Walachrian* Claſſis of *Zealand*, do in like manner declare publick forms to be lawful, and *profitable for the helping* and directing the attention of the auditors, and the preſerving Uniformity: and that in good forms of Prayer, Chriſtians may pray with a *humble ſenſe of their wants, with holy*

Synopſ. Purior. Theol. Diſp. 36. Sect. 33.

Confid. Contr. Ang. c. 7. q. 2.

holy affection, deſire, zeal, faith, and a Religious acting of the heart to God, ſuitable to their own caſes, nobis expertis certiſſimum eſt, is a thing (ſay they) *moſt certain to us who have experienced it.*

12. But the ſureſt way of tryal, whereby forms of Prayer may be manifeſted to bring no diſadvantage to the Church of themſelves, is from conſidering ſeveral arguments to that purpoſe, as 1. Becauſe (as I have ſhewed) God himſelf *preſcribed a conſtant form* of Prayer for the Jewiſh Offerings, and a form of Prieſtly bleſſing; and our Saviour directed the Lords Prayer as a form, and preſcribed a form of words for the *adminiſtring Baptiſm*; but it muſt be at the leaſt a great miſapprehenſion and ſin, to think that the holy God and our bleſſed Saviour, ſhould *command and enjoin* what is of its own nature *a hindrance to Godlineſs*, Piety and true Religion, and a diſadvantage to the Church. S. *Cyprian* ſaid well, *what Prayer can be more ſpiritual than that which was given to us by Chriſt, by whom the holy Spirit himſelf was ſent?* 2. Becauſe it is generally acknowledged that the *ſinging Pſalms of Prayer or praiſe* may be advantageouſly performed in a ſet form of words, and the *holy Scriptures* are not the leſs edifying nor the leſs applicable to our ſelves

De Orat. Dom.

ſelves becauſe they are contained in a ſet form of words, & both in reading the Scriptures and in Prayer our hearts ought to be religiouſly moved towards God though in ſomewhat a different manner. 3. Becauſe all the *ages of the Chriſtian Church from the firſt Centuries*, have uſed them as an *advantage to Religion*; and it is not at all probable, that ſuch excellently devout and judicious men, as the fourth and fifth Centuries abounded with, ſhould be ſo *ſtupid and dull ſpirited*, as not any of them to diſcern between the *helps and hindrances of religious devotion*, in matters of moſt ordinary practice. Wherefore though many mens minds may be moſt pleaſed and delighted with variety of expreſſion, there is no *prejudice to piety* from a ſet form, further than this is cauſed by prejudice againſt ſuch a form, or by want of *Religious temper* to join in it. Here I ſhall note what Mr. *Baxter* obſerveth (though he yield not ſo much uſe of forms as I plead for.) He ſaith, *the conſtant diſuſe of forms is apt to breed a giddineſs in Religion, and it may make men Hypocrites, who ſhall delude themſelves with conceits that they delight in God, when it is but in theſe novelties, and varieties of expreſſion that they are delighted*: and therefore he *adviſeth forms to fix Chriſti-*

Diſſ. of Liturgy Prop. 10.

ans

ans and make them ſound. And the arguments in the foregoing Section do evidence the benefits of their conſtant uſe.

SECT. III.

Of the manner of compoſing the Prayers in our Liturgie; chiefly of Reſponſals and ſhort Prayers.

1. Coming now to a particular conſideration of that *form of Prayer* enjoined in this Church, I ſhall wave ſuch things where the force and matter of the objections is cut off, by the alterations authoritatively made in the new eſtabliſhment of our *Liturgy*; and beginning with the Prayers themſelves in the daily ſervice, there are two things eſpecially to be treated of concerning their general frame and contexture. The *firſt* is that the people are required to bear a part in this ſervice, not only in that they are by voice to join in the *Confeſſion and Doxology*, but that ſeveral Petitions are required to be expreſſed, by the united voice of all the Aſſembly. This is condemned by the Non-Conformiſts who ſay that the *Miniſter is appointed for the people, in all publick ſervice appertaining to God*, and that the *people hereby ſeem to invade that ſacred office*; *the Scriptures making the Miniſter the mouth of the people to God in Prayer, and intimating the peoples part to be only to ſay*, Amen.

Except. of Presbyter. p. 4.

2. But

2. But ſince our Saviour condemneth the *teaching, or receiving for doctrines the commandments of men*; we may not embrace that as a Scripture doctrine, where the Scripture delivereth no ſuch thing. Indeed under the law there was a ſpecial command of God, that whatever legal Sacrifices were offered to him (ſome few extraordinary caſes only excepted) that ſervice was to be performed by the hand of the Prieſt; but there is no conſtitution under the Goſpel, that ſpiritual *Sacrifices of Prayer, thanksgiving*, or the expreſſion of a *contrite broken heart*, may be offered up to God in no other way than by the mouth of a Miniſter, though it be in a publick Aſſembly. And what they aſſert is (ſufficiently to other mens underſtandings) contradicted by themſelves, who allow the people liberty by their voices to join in *ſinging thoſe Pſalms* which contain both Prayers, Praiſes, and Confeſſions.

3. The truth is, all ſuch Prayers as have particular reference to the *Conſecration*, and *Adminiſtration* of the Sacraments, and to the *Miniſterial abſolution and benediction*, ought to be performed by the Miniſter alone (though it be in a private place, and upon a particular occaſion) becauſe theſe things include the

power

power of the Keys. But as for others the rules of order and edification will direct, that Prayers and Confeſſions which are conſiderably long ſhould be expreſſed by one, that the reſt may the better underſtand and join in them; and the authority of the Eccleſiaſtical office, and its order and degree in the Church, will require this to be performed by ſome in the Miniſtry. For this we have the examples of the Scripture times, to which agreeth the practice of the following ages; and the author under S. *Aug.* name ſaith, that *thoſe who are of authority in the Church, tota fere Eccleſia ſecum congemiſcente poſtulant & precantur, do put up their requeſts and Prayers, almoſt all the Church joining with their ſighs and groans.* Yet this practice doth no way diſallow the peoples vocal joining, in ſhort Ejaculations or in other generally known Petitions, ſince this may be of good uſe to *unite their affections* more firmly, to *quicken their minds* into a greater fervency, and to *fix their ſpirits* in a more diligent attending to the ſervice they are about, and more particularly to *expreſs their joining therein*, whereby they may both incite others, and uſe their tongues as inſtruments of Gods glory.

De Eccleſ. Dogm. c. 30.

4. Indeed S. *Paul* ſpeaketh of *him who occupieth*

occupieth the room of the unlearned, ſaying Amen, at their bleſſing or giving of thanks, 1 *Cor.* 14. 16. But the very phraſe of bleſſing and giving of thanks, makes it probable that this Text is to be underſtood as Mr. *Thorndike* expoundeth it, of the Conſecration of the Communion. And at that time the people did ordinarily anſwer *Amen*, and nothing more, as appeareth from the early teſtimonies of *Juſtin Martyr*, and *Dionyſius Biſhop of Alexandria*. 2. But if this ſenſe be not admitted, this Text of the Apoſtle doth neither mention, nor in the context more nearly refer to Prayer than to ſinging, in which latter the peoples bare ſaying *Amen* is not contended for, nor allowed as a conſtant rule for the Churches practice, though it was probably the uſual method in the Chriſtian Aſſemblies in thoſe *Apoſtolical days*, when the duty of ſinging was performed by the immediate inſpiration of the ſpirit, upon ſome particular perſons: and that theſe extraordinary motions of Gods ſpirit in thoſe times, were only vouchſafed *to the Clergy or Miniſtry*, is not probable from the contents of that very Chapter. And therefore this place of Scripture doth not confine the whole vocal ſervice of God (excepting an *Amen*) to the *Miniſtry*, the

Juſt. Mar. Ap. 2. Euſ. Hiſt. l. 7. c. 8.

the people being altogether debarred and excluded.

5. But that all the ſervants of God may allowably be intereſted, (where the due rules of order and edification are obſerved) in the outward *joint expreſſion of praiſe and Prayer to God*, is very agreeable to the holy Scriptures, where the holy Angels are repreſented to *cry one to another and ſay, Holy, holy, holy, is the Lord of Hoſts, the whole earth it full of his glory*, *Iſ.* 6. 3. and *all Iſrael praiſed God and ſaid, For he is good; for his mercy endureth for ever*, 2 Chr. 7. 3. And as S. *Paul* exhorteth that *with one mind and one mouth Chriſtians ſhould glorifie God*, *Rom.* 15. 6. S. *John* in his Viſion beheld and heard the *four living things, the Elders, the Angels, and every Creature in Heaven and Earth, expreſſing bleſſing, honour, glory and power unto God*, *Rev.* 4. 8,--11. *Ch.* 5. 8,--14. and a *great multitude whom no man could number, crying with a loud voice and ſaying, Salvation to our God, which ſitteth upon the throne, and to the Lamb.* *Rev.* 7. 9, 10. and *he heard alſo the voice of the* 144000. *who were with the Lamb on Mount Sion, as the voice of many Waters, and as the voice of a great thunder, ſinging a new Song.* *Rev.* 14. 1, 2, 3. and theſe places laſt mentioned are

are the more conſiderable, becauſe they contain repreſentative Viſions, of the ſervice acceptably performed to God in the Chriſtian Church.

6. If we conſult *Eccleſiaſtical practice*, there is very probable evidence, that under the Old Teſtament the people did vocally join by reſponſals, in the ordinary ſervice of God, in the *Sanctuary and Synagogues*. Both the *Joma* and other Tracts of the *Talmud*, mention the people in the period of their Prayers, expreſſing ברוך שם כבוד *&c. Bleſſed be the name of the glory of his Kingdom for ever and ever.* And the particular reſponſals uſed by the Jews at Circumciſion, are expreſſed by *Fagius*. The uſe of *alternate ſinging* among the *Eſſens* is ſufficiently known, but that this was of very ancient uſe in the Jewiſh Church, is very likely, becauſe the word ענה which properly ſignifieth to *anſwer*, is an uſual expreſſion of *ſinging* even in the holy Scriptures. And there appeareth conſiderable evidence, from *Ex.* 15. *v.* 1, *&* *v.* 20, 21. that that Song of *Moſes* and the Children of *Iſrael*, was uttered as *Philo Judæus* averreth, ἀντιφθόγγοις ἀρμονίαις *with reſponſal melodies alternately repeated.*

V. Hor. Hebr. in Mat. 6. 13.

In Ch. Par. in Deut. 10. 16.

Phil. de Vit. Moſ. l. 3.

7. In the Chriſtian Church, the Original of the *Antiphona*, or the alternate

ſinging of Hymns by two quires, is aſcribed by *Socrates* to *Ignatius*; the like uſe of *Davids* Pſalms is declared by *Theodoret*, to have had its beginning at *Antioch* from *Flavianus* and *Diodorus*. Their Original in the Latin Church is referred by *Platina* to *Damaſus*, and by *Walafridus Strabo* to S. *Ambroſe*: but both *Iſidorus Hiſpalenſis*, and *Rabanus Maurus*, do teſtifie that long before this, the *Reſponſoria* wherein the whole Quire anſwered to one Man, were known by that name and uſed in the Latin Church. And ſometimes the whole Aſſembly joined in their Hymns and Pſalms, ſometimes they were ſung by one alone all the reſt joining to eccho forth the ἀκροτελεύτια *or end of the Hymn*, and by the *Laodicean* Council the *whole Aſſembly* were not allowed to join in their publick ſinging, which was required to be performed by the *appointed ſingers only*. Thus the Eccleſiaſtical practice hath varied, according to what was thought prudent and convenient.

Iſ. Hiſp. de Eccl. Offic. l. 1. c. 7, 8. Rab. Maur. de Inſt. Cler. l. 2. c. 50, 51.

Conc. Laod. c. 15.

8. Concerning Prayers and Confeſſions, S. *Baſil* declareth it to have been in his time the ordinary practice of divers *Eaſtern Churches*, that every man *by his own words did profeſs repentance, and make confeſſion*. And *Gr. Nazianzene* acquainteth

Baſ. Ep. 63.

Naz. Or. 3.

quainteth us that *Julian* in imitation of the Chriſtians did appoint amongſt the Gentiles εὐχῶν τύποι ἐν μέρει *a form of Prayer to be ſaid in parts*, by way of *Reſponſals*. *Hierom* alſo relateth, that *populus cum ſacerdote loquitur in precibus, the people did ſpeak with the Prieſt in the Prayers*; and *Gregory* the great noteth, that in the Greek Church the *Lords Prayer was ordinarily ſaid by all the people together*: and as anciently as we can meet with any parcels of *Liturgy* or particular Offices, the uſe of *reſponſals* may be eaſily diſcerned, even as far as S. *Cyprians ſurſum corda*, and *Habemus ad Dominum*. Wherefore the uſe of reſponſals, and the people joining in ſome expreſſions in the publick ſervice of God, was a thing thought uſeful by the *ancient Church*, as well as by our own, and is allowable by the rules of the *Scripture*, and the *Order* of the publick worſhip of God: and whoſoever aſſert that the vocal joining of the people, in any expreſſions of Prayer, in the publick Aſſembly, is as *Uzziahs* action was, an intrenching upon the Prieſts Office; doth ſet up ſuch Bars about the ſervice of God, which do keep Gods people at a greater diſtance from the throne of Grace, than the nature and priviledge of Chriſtian liberty will allow.

Gr. Ep. l. 7. c. 63.

low. Yet the *compoſing* or *directing* particular Prayers for the publick uſe of Chriſtian Aſſemblies, is the proper work of the Church Officers who are to be the guides thereof; as alſo *teaching* and *inſtructing* (being an act of authority) doth ordinarily belong to the Miniſters of the Church; and this is that *ſpeaking* which is *forbidden to Women in the Church*, becauſe it is an act of authority, 1 *Cor.* 14. 34. 1 *Tim.* 2. 12. Whereas the joint expreſſing ſome words of *Confeſſion or ſupplication*, is wholly an act of humility, and is not forbidden by thoſe places of S. *Paul*, which purpoſely provide, that *women may not uſurp authority over the man, but be under obedience.*

9. The next thing to be conſidered in the compoſure of our publick ſervice, is, that it doth not contain *one continued Prayer only*, for a particular Office, which God hath no where commanded, but *ſeveral ſhort Prayers* which he hath no where forbidden. This hath been thought by many conſidering and Religious men, to be advantagious, for the quickning our affections and pious deſires towards God, and for preſerving the mind from deadneſs and dulneſs. But the ſhortneſs of theſe Prayers was cenſured formerly by the Non-Conformiſts, *to be ſhort cuts and*

and ſhreddings, and of late was ſtiled by the Presbyterians, *an affected empty toſſing Gods name in mens mouths, vain repetitions and tautologies, which are not the better but the worſe becauſe Gods name is made the matter of them.* But ſurely *ſcoffing expreſſions*, whereby they indulge themſelves to make ſport with Religious ſervice, is not a thing well becoming ſober men and Chriſtians; and is ſo much the worſe when they thereby caſt reproach, even upon the *devout* uſing the *holy name of God* in pious addreſſes to him. It is an eaſie thing for the vain fancies of men, if they be not more Chriſtianly principled, to make uſe of *ſcornful and deriding ſpeeches*, concerning any method of ſervice whatſoever, and indeed concerning any good thing: the effect of which would be to bring *contempt upon Religion* and diſhonour to him whom it ſhould be our endeavour to glorifie.

Presbyter. Papers. p. 47, 48.

10. But if we conſider ſoberly; the main difference between the uſe of *one continued long Prayer*, and *divers ſhort ones* to the ſame purpoſe, is this, that in theſe ſhort Prayers the *name and attributes of God* are more frequently mentioned in the beginning, as the ground of our adoration and dependance; and

the *merits of Chriſt* are often mentioned in the end thereof, as the only way and means of our acceſs to God, and obtaining grace and help from him; with a more frequent ſaying *Amen*, as an expreſſion of confidence and joint conſent in theſe Prayers. Since therefore the ſerious *ſenſe of God*, and an application to him, and confidence in him, with an eye to the *merits of Chriſt*, ought to take place in our minds throughout every petition in our Prayer; I cannot ſee how the vocal expreſſing them if *ſolemnly* performed, and not beyond what is *decent and convenient* can poſſibly fall under any juſt cenſure, unleſs it could be ſinful to expreſs that with the mouth in publick ſervice, which is both pious and requiſite to be conceived in the heart: eſpecially ſince it cannot be denied, but that *God is honoured* by us if we think of him frequently, provided it be alſo piouſly; and no imaginable account can be given, why he ſhould not be alſo honoured by us when we oft *expreſs his name* in Religious invocation of him, but not without a due *gravity*, *reverent devoutneſs*, and *pious affection*.

11. Indeed our Saviour condemneth *battology* or *vain repetitions*, where they think to be heard for their much ſpeaking.

ing, *Mat.* 6. 7. which is, when true Religion is neglected, and confidence placed in the ſound and multitude of words; as the Worſhippers of *Baal* cryed from Morning to Noon ſaying, *O* Baal *hear us*, 1 *King.* 18. 26. But the expreſſing our application to God and dependence upon Chriſt for ſeveral diſtinct bleſſings in the Liturgy, is not a *repetition of the ſame ſenſe* but of that which is different: and yet where the very ſame words and ſenſe are piouſly repeated, this is as far from the vain repetition our Saviour condemned, as vanity is from Piety. Such repetitions were frequently practiſed by the *Pſalmiſt*, and our Saviour himſelf praying thrice in a very ſhort diſtance of time, did *uſe the ſame words* as the Evangeliſts relate, *Mar.* 14. 39. *Mat.* 26. 44. And it is very obſervable, that theſe *repeated Prayers* were the Prayers of his agony, when he *prayed more earneſtly*, as is manifeſt from *Luk.* 22. 42, 43, 44. and with ſpecial reference to theſe Prayers, the Apoſtle declareth, that *in the days of his fleſh, he offered up Prayers and Supplications, with ſtrong cries and tears, unto him who was able to ſave him from death*, *Heb.* 5. 7. So that affectionate repetitions are no vain repetitions. And this may be ſufficient to juſtifie the *repeated*

uſe of the *Lords Prayer*, both before the uſe of the Pſalms, Hymns, Scriptures and Creed, and after them in the daily ſervice, as alſo in the deprecatory Prayers of the *Litany*, and in other particular Offices appointed.

Pr. Pap. ibid. Preſbyt. excep. p. 9.

12. But it is objected, that we have in Scriptures ſome examples of the ſupplications of holy men, where they are not compoſed of ſeveral *diſtinct ſhort Prayers*, but the whole matter of their addreſs is compriſed in one *entire* one. But here it is to be conſidered, 1. That there is as much or more reaſon to admit, that it is our neceſſary duty to obſerve no other *method in Preaching*, than what was uſed by the Prophets and Apoſtles, ſome of whoſe Sermons are probably extant in the Scriptures, as they were delivered to the *Jewiſh* and *Chriſtian Aſſemblies*; as there is to conclude that the method of our publick Prayers muſt be conformable to the Prayers of ſome holy men in Scripture, though we have probably no one Prayer *compriſed in the Scriptures*, which was the *entire ſervice* of the Jewiſh or Chriſtian publick Aſſemblies at that time. But the Non-Conformiſts themſelves do not judge themſelves obliged to follow the method of the Apoſtles Sermons, who ordinarily took

took *no texts*, and uſually made a continued diſcourſe, without *dividing* it into firſt and ſecondly. 2. Divers Prayers recorded in the holy Scriptures, which were either directed for the uſe of, or declared to have been uſed in their publick Aſſemblies, were *ſhort Prayers*, ſuch beſides the *Lords Prayer*, was the Prayer of *Hezekiah* referring to the *Paſſover*, 2 *Chr.* 30. 18, 19. the *Prayer of humiliation* directed for the Temple ſervice, *Joel* 2. 17, 18. and that of *Hoſ.* 14. 2, 3. and the time of theſe ſolemnities being conſidered, it cannot in reaſon be doubted, but that they uſed other Prayers beſides theſe, at the ſame time. 3. That the *Pſalms of David* were of ordinary uſe among the Jews as Hymns of praiſe, is acknowledged by the Jewiſh Writers, and is declared 2 *Chr.* 29. 30. and that divers Pſalms were uſed one after another, *at the Paſſover* and other Temple ſervices is generally owned, but why ſhould not the beginning one Pſalm after another be as much diſliked, as the beginning one Prayer after another? 4. There are ſome examples in the Scripture, of *one Prayer following another*, in the ſame ſervice of God and ſupplication to him. So beſides the Prayers in our *Saviours* agony above mentioned, *Solomon*

mon at the Dedication of the Temple immediately after the end of one *Prayer* upon his *knees*, 1 *Kin.* 8. 54. beginneth another Prayer of *benediction ſtanding*, *v.* 56, 57. and when the Goſpel ſervice was repreſented by a Viſion of *Angels*, *Elders and other Creatures*, *Rev.* 4. 8, 11. *Ch.* 5. 9, 12, 13, 14. *Ch.* 7. 10, 12. the worſhip of God was not there expreſſed in one continued Prayer, but in ſeveral *diſtinct ſhort* expreſſions of *adoration*.

5. No rule of Religion declareth any particular method of Prayer to recommend us to Gods acceptance and bleſſing, which is done by inward *grace and piety* which is not tyed to a certain model of expreſſion.

13. It hath been alſo objected, that it would be unſeemly and imprudent, for any man who *petitioned a great King, divers times to begin and end and then begin again, and therefore this is not to be allowed in our addreſs to God by that rule*, Mal. 1. 8. *Offer it now unto thy Governour.* But 1. The expreſſing divers Prayers one after another, is not to begin and end, but to continue in Prayer. 2. Nor is there any *indecorum*, if he who is to ſpeak to a King about ſeveral matters, ſhall when he paſſeth to a new head give the King ſome fit honourable title. 3. And chiefly

chiefly thoſe words in *Malachi* do require, that that reſpect and reverence which we are to expreſs to God, muſt not be leſs, but always greater than that which we give to any authority upon earth; but it no way directs us to the *ſame courſe in honouring and worſhipping God*, which we uſe in giving reſpect to our *Governour*. It is moſt proper for a mean man who would preſent a Petition to a King, not to attempt to come himſelf directly to the King or the Prince, but to make ſome favourite who is alſo a meer ſubject his friend to preſent his Petition; yet will not this plead for the *Popiſh addreſs to God by Saints and Angels*: and it would be accounted *intolerable impudence*, if a ſubject ſhould every day of his life twice, four times, or ſeven times a day, come into his preſence and prefer his ſuit to him in a great meaſure to one and the ſame effect at all times; whilſt this frequent practice of ſupplication to God is *a Religious devoutneſs*. Theſe things beſides divers others manifeſt, that the meaſuring divine ſervice and worſhip by the ſtandard of any humane reſpect, in all the particulars of our addreſs to God, is the way to commit an error as great as from Earth to Heaven.

14. But

14. But beſides this, if the ordinary *practice of the Church of God* be conſidered, it may be of uſe to diſcover what hath been accounted expedient, in a matter where God hath given no particular command. It hath been obſerved by divers learned men from *both the Talmuds*, that in and before the time of our Saviour the Jews had *eighteen diſtinct Prayers*, appointed for ordinary daily uſe of them who were moſt devout, when they who had not liberty to attend to them were to uſe the מעין or *ſummary* of them. And the ordinary cuſtom of celebrating the Jewiſh Paſsover, did contain ſeveral *diſtinct Prayers* and *benedictions*: which is a practice manifeſtly as ancient as the time of our Saviour.

Buxt. Lex. Rab. in עין *Hor. Heb. in Mat. 6. 9.*

Idem in Mat. 26. 26, 27.

15. In the Chriſtian Church the Liturgy framed by S. *Chryſoſtom*, and before him that of S. *Baſil* (though they have paſſed through conſiderable changes) ſufficiently appear to have been compoſed, after the manner of diſtinct *ſhort Prayers*: and S. *Baſil* declareth it to have been in his time the uſual practice at *Cæſarea*, and divers other Churches in the Eaſt, that even in the midſt of their Pſalmody, or *between their ſinging Pſalms or Hymns, they did frequently intermix Prayers*, μεταξὺ προσευχόμενοι. And in the *Latine*

Bux. Syn. Jud. c. 13.

Baſ. Ep. 63.

Latine Church the like uſe of ſhort Prayers is evident, from the compoſure of the *Ambroſian* and other very ancient Offices, divers of whoſe particular Prayers are collected, and exhibited in a diſtinct Treatiſe by *Caſſander*. Theſe things (beſides what might be obſerved from *Clemens* his Conſtitutions, and the Prayers uſed by the Brethren in *Egypt*, which were *very ſhort* as S. *Auguſtin* relateth) do give conſiderable evidence of the ancient practice of the Chriſtian Church, and render it very probable that the like methods of Prayer were uſed before the time of theſe Fathers, becauſe it is very unlikely, that a perfect new *method and model* of the ſervice of God, of a quite different nature from what was of former uſe amongſt *any Chriſtians*, ſhould about the ſame time be introduced into places ſo remote from each other, as *Italy*, *Cappadocia*, *Egypt*, *Syria* and others. And as that architect who diſparageth a Fabrick which himſelf cannot equal, doth thereby diſplay his own imprudence; ſo it can be no part of wiſdom, for perſons in the preſent age, to condemn the *prudence of the ancient Chriſtians*, in ordering their Religious ſervice, when they were as well before us in the devoutneſs of their Religious piety, as in time.

Caſſ. Preces Eccleſiaſt.

Aug. Ep. 121. *c.* 10.

16. The

16. The *laſt thing* to be conſidered, concerning the compoſure of the Liturgy, is, that it ſtandeth charged by ſome, who have greater regard to the ſerving an intereſt than to truth, to be wholly *Romiſh*, and to be taken out of the *Romiſh Breviary Miſſal and their other Rituals.* Whereas in truth the doctrine of no Proteſtant Church differeth ſo much from that of the Church of *Rome*, as the model of our Liturgy doth from their *Maſs* and other Offices; where our reformers have rejected all things that were *corrupt or inconvenient* in themſelves, which were very many, and have added much which was thought *neceſſary or expedient*, and have put the whole ſervice into a different and more *regular frame.* Indeed ſeveral pious Prayers (of which the *Lords Prayer* is one) with ſome ancient and approved *Hymns*, and the *Creed* (beſides Pſalms and Scriptures) which were by *them uſed*, are by *us retained.* And as for ſuch perſons who aſſert, that every thing made uſe of in the *Romiſh* ſervice though never ſo innocent, ought to be rejected, let them conſider that upon this principle there were ſome who aſſerted it neceſſary to diſclaim our *Creed*, and renounce the doctrine of the *Trinity*, becauſe it might not be acknowledged

V. Zanch. ad Arianum Reſp. de Antithes. Chriſti & Antichriſti.

(ſaid

(ſaid they) that the *Romaniſts* did retain any true belief concerning *God*. And that ſtrange deſign of raſh rejecting thoſe things in Religion, (though uſeful and good) which they embrace, as it hath unchriſtianly engaged ſome to *deny the Divinity of Chriſt*; ſo if it be without all bounds entertained, it may engage others impiouſly to *diſown the holy Scriptures*, and the true God: whereas our Chriſtian profeſſion requireth us *to prove all things, and to hold faſt that which is good*. 1 *Theſ.* 5. 21.

SECT. IV.

Of the Doxology, Athanaſian *Creed, and ſome particular expreſſions in the Litany.*

1. The frequent uſe of that Doxology, *Glory be to the Father, &c.* which is ſo much diſliked by ſome, is ſufficiently vindicated from *Battology*, or a vain and ſuperſtitious multiplying of words, in the foregoing Section. To which I ſhall here add theſe conſiderations. 1. That it ſeemeth unreaſonable and *partial* that they who allowed themſelves in the concluſion of their own Prayers, to uſe that Doxology, *To whom* (Chriſt) *with the Father*

Father and the Holy Ghoſt be Glory, frequently four or five times in the ſame Aſſembly, ſhould undertake to determine, that this other *Doxology* (more expreſly acknowledging divine glory eternally due to all the three perſons of the Trinity) is unfit to be uſed more than *once in the Morning, and once in the Evening.* 2. That ſince in all our Chriſtian ſervice, and eſpecially in Hymns and Pſalms of praiſe, it is our duty to give glory to the *holy Trinity*, it cannot be blameable to expreſs that with our mouths, which is at that time the moſt fit and proper exerciſe of our minds. 3. That it is manifeſt from divers paſſages of the *Pſalms*, and other *Scriptures*, as 2 *Chr.* 5. 13. *Ch.* 7. 3. *Ch.* 20. 21. *Ezr.* 3. 11. *Jer.* 33. 11. that with their Hymns or Pſalms, the Jews ordinarily uſed ſome ſuch *Doxology* as this, *Hallelujah or praiſe ye the Lord, for he is good, for his mercy endureth for ever.* Hence it is probably conjectured that preparation to the *Pæaniſm* among the Gentiles ἰαπαιὸν ἰὴ or ἰὲ had its original (being the corruption of *Hallelujah.*) And from this uſe of the Jews the *Arabian Church* their Neighbours did probably derive their practice, of expreſſing *Hallelujah* at the end of every Pſalm, as appeareth in the Arabick verſion

Except. of Presbyter. p. 16.

Delph. Phœnic. c. 6.

verſion of the Pſalms, who alſo make uſe of this *Doxology* to the three perſons diſtinctly, which is expreſſed in the *Arabick verſion* at the end of every tenth Pſalm, but was probably in practice at the end of every Pſalm. And that the Weſtern Church uſed this Doxology, *Glory be to the Father*, at the end of every Pſalm, we have the teſtimony of *Caſſian*, for about thirteen hundred years ſince. Wherefore ſince this is of ſo *ancient original* in the Chriſtian Church, ſo agreeable to the practice of the *Jewiſh Church*, approved by the *Holy Scriptures*, and a practice ſo reaſonable in it ſelf, it may be *piouſly uſed*, but not juſtly blamed in our Liturgy.

Caſſian. Col. l. 1. c. 8.

2. The reading the *Athanaſian Creed* to ſome (though not the generality of Non-Conformiſts) who heartily own the doctrine of the Trinity, hath been thought a matter not free from difficulty. For that Creed expreſſing what muſt be believed of every one who would be ſaved, doth contain deep myſteries (as for inſtance,) *that the Son is not made nor created but begotten*, and *that the Holy Ghoſt is neither made nor created nor begotten, but proceeding*. Now ſince believing things as neceſſary to Salvation, is not an aſſent to the uſe of Phraſes and expreſſions, but to the ſenſe contained in them, it muſt

enclude that there is ſome difference underſtood between what is *affirmed* and what is *denied*. But the difference between the Eternal *Generation*, and Eternal *Proceſſion*, being a Myſtery where the greateſt Divines ſee but *darkly*, they are juſtly afraid to condemn all perſons as uncapable of Salvation, who cannot reach to ſo *high a pitch*.

3. But here it is to be conſidered, that in that Creed commonly called the *Athanaſian*, there are ſome things contained and expreſſed as *neceſſary points of Faith*; and other things for a more clear and uſeful explication of the truth, though they be not of equal neceſſity to be underſtood and believed even by the meaneſt capacities. Thus if we firſt conſider the contexture of that Creed, the Faith declared neceſſary concerning the Trinity, is thus expreſſed in the beginning thereof, *The Catholick Faith is this, that we worſhip one God in Trinity, and Trinity in Unity, neither confounding the perſons, nor dividing the ſubſtance.* After this followeth an explication, uſeful to ſet forth the true Chriſtian Doctrine, which beginneth, *For there is one perſon of the Father, &c.* after which explication, the ſame neceſſary doctrine to be known and believed, is thus again expreſſed,

greſſed, and diſtinguiſhed from that *explication* in theſe words, *So that in all things as is aforeſaid, the Unity in Trinity, and Trinity in Unity is to be worſhipped, he therefore who will be ſaved muſt thus think of the Trinity.* So that the acknowledging and worſhipping the *Trinity of perſons*, and *Unity of Godhead*, is that which only is declared neceſſary in the former part of that Creed; and this muſt be acknowledged neceſſary, ſince we are baptized into the name of the *Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghoſt*, and we muſt *believe and worſhip* according as we are *baptized.*

4. What is contained in this conſideration is the more clear (both with reference to the inſtance mentioned, and to the *Union of the two natures in Chriſt*,) by this following obſervation: *viz.* That our Church doth both here and in her Articles, evidently receive the *Athanaſian Creed*: and yet from the manner of uſing *the Apoſtles Creed*, in the *form of Baptiſm*, as containing the profeſſion of that Faith into which we are baptized; *in the Catechiſm* as containing all the Articles of the Chriſtian Faith; and in the *Viſitation of the ſick*, as being a rule to try whether he believe as a Chriſtian man ſhould or not; it is manifeſt that no more is eſteem-

ed in our Church, of *neceſſity to ſalvation* for all men to believe, than that only which is contained and expreſſed in the *Apoſtles Creed.*

5. I proceed to conſider ſome expreſſions in the *Litany.* In the way to which I ſhall only reflect upon that objection, (which if it had not been miſtaken had been very inconſiderable) framed by Mr. *Cartwright* againſt the Litany in General; That it being chiefly a deprecatory Prayer againſt evils, was framed by *Mamertus Biſhop of Vienna* (or rather *Vienne in France*) upon a ſpecial occaſion of the calamities of that Country. This was a very ſtrange and groſs miſtake, for the *Litaniæ* which were ordered by *Mamertus* were days of ſupplication in *Rogation Week*, which days were called *Litania minor*, *triduanæ Litaniæ*, and by ſome *Litania major*, as is manifeſt from *Alcuinus*, *Amalarius*, *Strabo*, *Micrologus*, *Rupertus Tuitienſis*, *Johannes Beleth*; beſides other later Ritualiſts, and the French Hiſtorians, eſpecially *Gregorius Turonenſis*, who all mention what *Mamertus* did, in appointing days of Prayer, which were called *Litaniæ*, to be yearly obſerved, for the obtaining Gods mercy in their diſtreſs, occaſioned by wild Beaſts and frequent Earthquakes. But that deprecatory

Alcuin. de Div. Offic. Tit. de dieb. Rogat. Amal. de Eccl. Offic. l. 1. c. 37. Strab. de Reb. Eccl. c. 28. Micr. c. 57.

precatory Prayers which are called Litanies alſo, and were ſo called by S. *Baſil*, and were of ſo great uſe in the *ſtationary days* of the ancient Church, ſhould have their original from *Mamertus*, who lived many hundred years after, is a notion built upon no other foundation, but the manifeſt miſ-apprehending the ſenſe of that word *Litania*.

6. Amongſt the particular expreſſions in the Litany, diſliked by many Non-Conformiſts, the firſt is where we pray to be delivered *from fornication, and all other deadly ſin*. But the phraſe of deadly ſin is ſufficiently warranted from theſe places of Scripture, *Rom.* 6. 23. *the wages of ſin is death*. Jam. 1. 15. *Sin when it hath conceived bringeth forth death*. Jam. 3. 8. *The tongue is full of deadly poiſon*. And the ſenſe of this phraſe in this place is this, that we here pray to be kept from all ſuch ſins as are moſt deſtructive and pernicious (which is all one with deadly) and to be delivered from all ſin (the nature of all ſin encluding a tendency to death) and this extenſive ſenſe of this phraſe, is both ſuitable to the pious deſires of a Chriſtian, and agreeable to the comprehenſiveneſs of the following words, *From all the deceits of the World, the fleſh and the Devil, Good Lord deliver us*.

7. That Petition againſt *ſudden death*, hath alſo been much excepted againſt, and *Druſius* ſeemed to have an eye to this, writing upon that expreſſion in *Job*, concerning the wicked, *They ſpend their days in wealth, and in a moment go down to the grave*; that is (ſaith he) they dye *cita morte quam aliqui deprecantur, ſed viderint an recte.* But if that learned man had any deſign from this text to cenſure this *Prayer of our Liturgy*, he hath greatly miſcarried in his attempt. For if he with others be right in the expoſition of that phraſe (which may well be underſtood that the life of the wicked was *ſo proſperous, that it ſeemed not to them tedious and long*) I ſay if his ſenſe be embraced, theſe words cannot be allowed to contain ſuch bleſſings, as were really advantageous to the wicked, and truly deſireable for him; but only ſuch things at the beſt, as appeared good to them who have their eye no farther than the things of this life; unleſs his being *in a moment cut off from all hopes of the time of grace and repentance*, could be a bleſſing.

Druſ. in Job. 21. 13.

8. I doubt not but the intent of praying againſt *ſudden death*, is this, that whereas many dangers might daily ſurprize us, and by a ſudden ſtroke end our lives, if divine providence did not protect

us,

us, we here commit our ſelves to Gods keeping, to be *preſerved by his care* from ſuch judgments and dangers. And ſuch a ſudden death is a dreadful eſtate to the wicked, and to dye as *Joſiah* or *Uzzah* did, is not deſirable to the moſt holy and pious men, who according to the example of *Jacob*, *David*, and our bleſſed *Saviour* himſelf by their holy inſtructions at the time of their death, may become uſeful for the bettering the lives of them who ſurvive.

9. But they tell us, there may be *ſudden death in a lawful War or Martyrdom.* To which I anſwer. 1. That ſudden unexpected death is chiefly intended in this *Prayer*, and in this ſenſe *Martyrdom* is not always a ſudden death. 2. That the example of our Saviour, who prayed with ſubmiſſion to his Fathers will, that *that Cup might paſs from him*, will warrant the like ſubmiſſive Prayer in any of his Diſciples. 3. And chiefly it is upon divers accounts both *lawful and fit*, to pray that we may not be ſuddenly taken away, either by *Martyrdom or War.* For though Chriſtianity tendeth to prepare men to be willing and ready, upon juſt occaſions to hazard or lay down their lives; yet *touching Martyrdom*, true Chriſtian charity towards all men, and ſin-

cere love to the Church of God, will direct us to pray, that the truth of God may ever be ſo *countenanced* in the World (if God ſee it good) and eſpecially amongſt us, that the Church of God may be free from perſecution, and that none in the World may be ſo wicked, as to *oppoſe Religion*, with deſign to take away the lives of its Profeſſors; and that the true members of the Church of God may be preſerved from ſuch *cruelties* as were exerciſed in divers horrid maſſacres, and were deſigned in the *Gunpowder-treaſon*. And ſo far as concerneth *ſudden death in lawful Wars*, the peaceableneſs of the doctrine of Chriſtianity, will not only allow but excite us to pray, that righteouſneſs and love may ſo far *prevail* in the World, that none may through any *injuſtice*, *pride*, or *inordinate affections promote Wars*, and that Swords may be turned into Plow-ſhares rather than ſheathed in one anothers bowels. However to be preſerved in the day of Battel, is a mercy which as it deſerveth *thankful acknowledgement* when enjoyed, ſo it may without all blame be deſired with ſubmiſſion to the divine will, to which purpoſe there are divers paſſages in the Book of *Pſalms*.

10. If

10. If we further conſider the ſtate of the moſt pious man even upon his own account; it is acknowledged that it is not conſiderable *ferrum an febris de corpore ſolverit*, as S. *Aug.* expreſſeth it, *whether he die in his bed or be ſlain in the field*: yet even ſo holy a man as S. *Auſtin* himſelf was, did both value and make good uſe of the time of his *ſenſible approaching death*, that he might be *found well doing*, and be the better prepared to die, by affectionate renewing the exerciſe of *repentance*, *humble confeſſion*, and lively *faith*. But in ſhort, to return to the proper and direct ſenſe of this Petition in the Litany, let that man alone who judgeth it unfit to *commit himſelf to the protection of God*, *to be preſerved from dangers which may aſſault his life*, condemn and reject this Petition againſt ſudden death. *Aug.* 122. *Poſid. in Vit. Aug.* c. 31.

11. Another Petition which meeteth with oppoſition, is this, *That it may pleaſe thee to preſerve all that travel by land or by water*: for this is ſuppoſed to enclude the praying for Thieves and Robbers, and Pirates and Traitors going on ſuch errands as *Faux* did. But this objection is a violent detorting theſe words; for he is properly *a traveller* who goeth upon his allowable or ordinary occaſions. If the meaneſt man in the Country ſhould hear *Pap. of Com. p.* 27.

hear of an Act of *Parliament*, for ſecureing the ſafe paſſage of all travellers, he would never thence conclude, that they intended to provide for the *ſafety of Robbers, Highway-men and Traitors*, who are the great diſturbers of ſafety. Might not the inſtances objected be alledged againſt S. *Paul*, commanding that *Prayer be made for all men?* and againſt the *Geneva* form, commending to Gods care *ſingulos etiam homines, all particular men in priſon, baniſhment, &c.* as well as againſt this Phraſe in the Litany? eſpecially if that comprehenſive ſenſe be allowed in this Petition, which charity will admit, that God would not only *preſerve the bodies* of them that travel from outward danger, but *their ſouls* alſo from ſin and their *whole man* from deſtruction. And in this ſenſe if this Petition ſhould be ſuppoſed to include (which in the proper ſenſe of the words it doth not) even Traitors and Robbers, can we be blamed to pray even for them that God would *preſerve* them from further ſin, and ſo keep them that they may have time and grace for *repentance*, and that thereby they may be *preſerved* from eternal deſtruction, (according to *Mat.* 5. 44.)

Prec. Eccl. Genev. poſt Conc. & in Cœna Dom.

12. That Petition that *God would have mercy upon all men*, is condemned by ſome, but

but is certainly commanded by S. *Paul*, requiring us to make *Prayers for all men*: for nothing can be prayed for, which doth not include Gods mercy. But ſuch *light objections*, which are eaſily made againſt the beſt words, that the *wiſdom and piety* of man can deviſe, I think not worthy the further naming, but ſhall now proceed to ſome other matters of greater moment.

SECT. V.

Conſiderations concerning the publick reading Apocryphal *Chapters.*

1. The reading the *Apocryphal* Chapters in our Church, hath been ſeverely cenſured, as if it was a *forſaking the holy Scriptures which are the waters of life, to drink of other unwholſom ſtreams*: but that this matter may be rightly underſtood, without prejudice or miſtake, it will be requiſite to take notice of theſe following conſiderations.

2. *Conſ.* 1. The excellent *authority of the Canonical Books* of Holy Scripture, as they are diſtinguiſhed from the Apocryphal, is fully and clearly acknowledged by this Church in her Articles, where it declareth concerning the Apocryphal Books, *Art.* 6.

Books, that *the Church (as S.* Hierome *ſaith) doth read them for example of life, and inſtruction of manners; but yet doth it not apply them to eſtabliſh any doctrine:* which Article plainly diſclaimeth them from being accounted Canonical Books of the Holy Scripture. That the Jews do not own theſe Books as any part of the *Old Teſtament*, is manifeſt from their Bibles which contain them not, and the particular evidences from the *Jewiſh Rabbins*, againſt every one of thoſe *ſeven Books of the Apocrypha*, which are forged to be Canonical by the Council of *Trent*, are ſome of them exhibited by *Hottinger*. And that neither the ancient Church of the Jews before the deſtruction of *Jeruſalem*, nor *Chriſt and his Apoſtles*, nor the ſeveral Ages of the Chriſtian Church till ſome late *Romiſh Councils*, did acknowledge or make uſe of theſe Books as Canonical, is ſolidly and learnedly evidenced by the *Biſhop of Durham*, with reference to the ſixth Article of this Church. Wherefore though it would be injurious to the holy Scriptures, that any other Books which are not of divine inſpiration, ſhould be accounted of equal authority with them; yet it is far from being a diſhonour either to them, or to the holy Spirit who indited them, if either

Theſ. Phil. l. 2. c. 2. Sect. 1.

Schol. Hiſt. of Can. of Scripture throughout.

ther theſe *Apocryphal* or any other good Books, be eſteemed uſeful and profitable, and acknowledged to contain things that are true and good.

3. *Conſ.* 2. It was an uſual practice in the ancient Chriſtian Church, that ſome of theſe *Apocryphal* Books, and other *good writings beſides the holy Scriptures*, were publickly read, as inſtructive Leſſons in their Aſſemblies, but with ſuch variation as the prudence of every Church thought meet. In the ſecond Century, both the *Epiſtle of Clemens* ἐξ ἀρχαίου ἔθους *according to the then ancient Cuſtom*, and ſome other *Eccleſiaſtical Epiſtles* were publickly read *even on the Lords days*, for their inſtruction, as *Dionyſius* of *Corinth* teſtifieth. And in *Euſebius* his time as well as before it, was the Epiſtle of *Clemens* publickly read ἐν πλείσαις ἐκκλησίαις *in the greateſt number of Churches*. In the *African* Church in S. *Auguſtins* time, *the Hiſtories of the paſſions of Martyrs*, (v. Hom. 26. inter. 50.) *and accounts of miraculous works by the efficacy of Chriſtian Prayer*, were read in their Churches, which Cuſtom though it was very pious in the beginning, was at laſt intolerably abuſed to the bringing in *legend ſtories*. And more particularly the publick reading ſeveral Apocryphal Books; as *Wiſdom*, *Eccleſiaſticus*, *Tobit*, *Judith*

In Euſ. Hiſt. l. 4. c. 23.

Ibid. l. 3. c. 16.

Aug. de Civ. Dei l. 22. c. 8. Hom. de Sanct. de S. Steph. Ser. 7.

3. Carth. c. 47. Conc. Carth. c. 87.

Judith and the Maccabees, was ordered in one of the *Carthaginian* Councils in S. *Auguſtins* time, and that *Canon* was taken into their Code; and beſides what S. *Hierom* oft ſpeaketh of theſe Books being read in the Church, (but diſtinguiſhed from their Canon) *Ruffinus* his contemporary, who was firſt his friend, and then his adverſary, having given firſt an account of the *Canonical* Books, proceedeth to theſe Books which he ſaith are *not Canonical but Eccleſiaſtical*, as *Eccleſiaſticus*, *Wiſdom*, *Tobit*, *Judith*, &c. and declareth the judgment of the ancient Fathers before his time concerning them, *quæ omnia legi quidem in Eccleſiis voluerunt, ſed non proferri ad auctoritatem ex his fidei confirmandam, that they would have them all to be read in the Churches, but not to be produced as of authority to confirm any matters of Faith.* And that in after Ages theſe Books were read in the Church, is evident from *Iſidorus Hiſpalenſis*, and in the very ſame words from *Rabanus Maurus*, and might be ſhewed from very many others, if that was needful.

Ruff. in Symb.

Iſid. de Eccl. Off. l. 1. c. 11, 12. Rab. de Inſt. Cler. l. 2. c. 53.

4. *Conſ.* 3. Theſe Books called the *Apocrypha* have been greatly eſteemed, both in the ancient Church, and by the chief Proteſtant Writers, as *very uſeful* (though not

not divine) *writings*. Divers of the ancients have cited them under the title of the *holy Scripture*, uſing that Phraſe in ſo great a latitude, as to ſignifie only *holy writings* though not *divinely inſpired*. The Council of *Carthage* above-named doth there call them *Canonical Books*, as doth alſo S. *Auguſtin* who was in that Council; uſing the word Canonical in a large ſenſe: for it is manifeſt from that and divers places of S. *Aug.* that they were not eſteemed *of equal authority*, with thoſe Books properly called Canonical. And therefore *Cajetan* for the interpretation of the right ſenſe of theſe words, hath well declared concerning theſe Books, *Non ſunt Canonici i. e. regulares ad firmandum ea quæ ſunt fidei; poſſunt tamen dici Canonici hoc eſt regulares ad ædificationem fidelium*, or, *they are not Canonical as containing a rule to direct our faith and belief, though they may ſometimes be called Canonical as containing rules to better our lives*. In the Greek Church, where they were not (at leaſt ſo much) publickly read as in the Latin, they were accounted uſeful for inſtruction, as appeareth (beſides the Citations of the Greek Fathers) from that very *Epiſtle of Athanaſius*, where he purpoſely declareth them to be no part of the Canon of Scripture.

De Doct. Chriſt. lib. 2. c. 8.

Caj. Com. in Eſth. in fin.

Fragm. Epiſt. 39. in Tom. 2. Athanaſ.

And

3. Carth. c. 47. Conc. Carth. c. 87. *Judith and the Maccabees*, was ordered in one of the *Carthaginian* Councils in S. *Auguſtins* time, and that *Canon* was taken into their Code; and beſides what S. *Hierom* oft ſpeaketh of theſe Books being read in the Church, (but diſtinguiſhed from their Canon) *Ruffinus* his contemporary, who was firſt his friend, and then his adverſary, having given firſt an account of the *Canonical* Books, proceedeth to theſe Books which he ſaith are *not Canonical but Eccleſiaſtical*, as *Eccleſiaſticus*, *Wiſdom*, *Tobit*, *Judith*, *&c.* and declareth the judgment of the ancient Fathers before his time concerning them, *quæ omnia legi quidem in Eccleſiis voluerunt, ſed non proferri ad auctoritatem ex his fidei confirmandam, that they would have them all to be read in the Churches, but not to be produced as of authority to confirm any matters of Faith.* And that in after Ages theſe Books were read in the Church, is evident from *Iſidorus Hiſpalenſis*, and in the very ſame words from *Rabanus Maurus*, and might be ſhewed from very many others, if that was needful.

Ruff. in Symb.

Iſid. de Eccl. Off. l. 1. c. 11, 12. Rab. de Inſt. Cler. l. 2. c. 53.

4. *Conſ.* 3. Theſe Books called the *Apocrypha* have been greatly eſteemed, both in the ancient Church, and by the chief Proteſtant Writers, as *very uſeful* (though not

not divine) *writings.* Divers of the ancients have cited them under the title of the *holy Scripture*, uſing that Phraſe in ſo great a latitude, as to ſignifie only *holy writings* though not *divinely inſpired*. The Council of *Carthage* above-named doth there call them *Canonical Books*, as doth alſo S. *Auguſtin* who was in that Council; uſing the word Canonical in a large ſenſe: for it is manifeſt from that and divers places of S. *Aug.* that they were not eſteemed *of equal authority*, with thoſe Books properly called Canonical. And therefore *Cajetan* for the interpretation of the right ſenſe of theſe words, hath well declared concerning theſe Books, *Non ſunt Canonici i. e. regulares ad firmandum ea quæ ſunt fidei; poſſunt tamen dici Canonici hoc eſt regulares ad ædificationem fidelium*, or, *they are not Canonical as containing a rule to direct our faith and belief, though they may ſometimes be called Canonical as containing rules to better our lives.* In the Greek Church, where they were not (at leaſt ſo much) publickly read as in the Latin, they were accounted uſeful for inſtruction, as appeareth (beſides the Citations of the Greek Fathers) from that very *Epiſtle of Athanaſius*, where he purpoſely declareth them to be no part of the Canon of Scripture.

De Doct. Chriſt. lib. 2. c. 8.

Caj. Com. in Eſth. in fin.

Fragm. Epiſt. 39. in Tom. 2. Athanaſ.

And

And amongst the Protestants Dr. *Reinolds* who wrote so largely against the authority of the *Apocryphal Books*, in his *Censura*, yet in one of his Prælections declareth of some of them, chiefly *Ecclesiasticus* and *Wisdom*, *valde bonos & utiles esse & omnibus tractationibus præferendos*, *that they are exceeding good and profitable, and to be preferred before all Treatises of other Writers*, and in a nother Prælection expressing his judgment of the same Books, saith, *proximum illis locum deberi post scripturam sacram*, *that they ought to have the next place after the holy Scripture*; in the former of which expressions, he followeth the steps of S. *Aug. de prædestin. Sanctorum*. And *Chemnitius* alloweth them to be Books, *quæ à fidelibus in Ecclesiis legnntur*, *Which are read in the Churches by the faithful*, and *non esse abjectos & damnatos*, *that they are not condemned writings and off-casts*, but may be received in the number of the *holy writings* (or *sacræ scripturæ*) *so beit they be not reputed the Canon of Faith*: and this saith he *we willingly both yield and teach*.

Censura de Lib. Apocr. Præl. 7.

Præl. 74.

Exam. parte 1. de Scrip. Can.

5. *Conf.* 4. And it is in this Case especially to be considered, that in our Church no Apocryphal Chapter is appointed for any Lords Day throughout the Year: nor is any directed for any Holy-day, but

but only out of *Wiſdom* and *Eccleſiaſticus*, which are Books of great eſteem with all thoſe who have well conſidered them. And alſo upon thoſe Week-days when ſome Apocryphal Chapters are read, there are always other Canonical Scriptures read likewiſe: whereas they who do oppoſe Conformity (ſo far as we may take the *Directory* for their rule) did never appoint or direct any Scriptures, to be ordinarily and publickly read upon any of theſe week days; but ordered that *where the reading on either Teſtament endeth on one Lords day, it ſhould begin on the next.* Wherefore it is to be well noted and obſerved, that our Church doth not herein differ from the diſſenters, as if they did require the Canonical Scriptures to be more frequently read in publick than our *Kalendar* appointeth, but our *Kalendar* requireth the Holy Scriptures to be much more frequently read in publick, (almoſt *ſix Chapters for one beſides the Epiſtles and Goſpels*) than the *Directory* did; and beſides them theſe Apocryphal Leſſons for profitable inſtruction.

Directory of reading the holy Script.

6. But if any perſons ſhall decry in the general, the hearing any thing in the Church, beſides the *holy Scriptures of immediate infallible inſpiration*, this would either from unadviſedneſs or from what

is worſe, reject and diſown, to the great diſadvantage of Religion, the uſe of Sermons, Exhortations, and Catechiſm. Nor is it any ſufficient cauſe to condemn the reading Apocryphal Chapters, becauſe they are read as one of *the Leſſons*: For our Church manifeſtly declareth theſe Leſſons not to be Canonical Scripture; nor can any command of God be produced, which either directly or by conſequence, requireth that in every daily Aſſembly of *Chriſtians*, there muſt be two Leſſons read out of the Canonical Scripture, or that none may be taken out of any other approved Book. And it is manifeſt that the cenſuring this practice condemneth divers, if not all the *ancient Churches*, before the decaying and degeneracy of the Chriſtian Profeſſion. For though it be admitted that the *Laodicean Council* did appoint that none but the Canonical Books ſhould be read in the Church, and that *Baruch* and the *Epiſtle of Jeremy* there mentioned are intended for parts of the Prophecy of *Jeremy*, yet long before that did even the Greek Church read *the Epiſtles of Clemens*, *&c.* above mentioned, and the Book of *Hermas*. And it is not to be wondered that there ſhould be different practices obſerved in the Church, in matters of order and liberty. 7. *Conſ.*

V. Biſhop of Durhams Schol. Hiſt. of Can. of Scrip. Sect. 60.

7. *Conſ.* 5. Whereas this Church is the more blamed, for *uſing* ſome Apocryphal Chapters, while ſome others acknowledged to be Canonical Scripture, are not *appointed* to be read by the *Kalendar* (which are moſtly either ſome Prophecies hard to be underſtood, or matters of Genealogy or Jewiſh Obſervations, or ſome Hiſtories for the moſt part expreſſed in other Scriptures appointed to be read) it muſt be conſidered, that even hence it is evident that the Kalendar was never intended to be a *Determination or Declaration* of what is *Canonical Scripture*, and of certain divine authority, but only a direction for uſeful and profitable reading. Nor was it the Cuſtom of the ancient Chriſtian Church, that the Canon of the Scripture ſhould be deſcribed by what was publickly read: the rule of the *Laodicean Council* which cometh neareſt thereto, did not direct the Revelation to be read. The ancient Jews who divided the Old Teſtament into the Law, the Prophets, and the *Hagiographa*; did for a long time only read the *Law* in the Synagogues, after which only a *Section of the Prophets* was added: but that the *Hagiographa* (which included all the Books from the beginning of the Chronicles to the end of the Canti-

Conc. Laod. c. 60.

Bux. Syn. Jud. c. 11. *Salian Annal. Eccl. A. M.* 3447. *n.* 16.

cles, beſides *Ruth*, *Lamentations* and *Daniel*,) were not read in the Jewiſh Synagogues, hath been obſerved from the *Talmudiſts*: and this is agreeable to divers paſſages of the New Teſtament. *Luk.* 4. 16. *Act.* 13. 15, 27. *Act.* 15. 21. Yet Chriſt and his Apoſtles blamed not the Jews, but joined with them in this ſervice.

Hor. Heb. in Joh. 4. 15.

8. *Conſ.* 6. That which is objected from the *matter of theſe Apocryphal Chapters*, which are appointed to be read, is not ſufficient either to prove them hurtful or not uſeful, as will appear from the following Section.

SECT. VI.

The Objections from the matter of the Apocrypha diſcuſſed.

1. Among the particular Objections from the matter of theſe Books.

Obj. 1. *Judith, Suſanna, Bel and the Dragon are thought to be fabulous, becauſe no certain time can be eaſily fixed for Judith.* S. *Hierome calleth the other Suſannæ, Belis & Draconis fabulas, and* Joſephus *maketh no mention of them.* But firſt, if theſe Books ſhould be admitted to be *parabolical diſcourſes*, to expreſs the great oppoſition of many wicked men againſt God,

Prol. in Dan. & Com. in Dan. 13. & 14.

God, and his Worſhip, the Vanity and Folly of their Pride and evil deſigns, and the mighty protection that God can give to his people by his Almighty Power, they might ſtill be *allowed* to be of very conſiderable uſe. The frequent uſe of Parabolical Inſtructions among the Jews, is both manifeſt from their Talmudical Writers, and allowed by the practice of our Saviour. And beſides this, they had another Cuſtom of *Cloathing real Hiſtories* under different names which expreſſed a reſemblance of the things intended: whence the *Targum* mentioning the expedition againſt *Antiochus*, ſpeaketh of him under the name of *Alexander*, and the Prophet ſpeaketh to the Jews under the ſtile of *the rulers of* Sodom *and the Elders of* Gomorrha. *Targ. in Cant. c. 6. v. 7, 9.*

2. And ſecondly the Objection is not ſufficient to diſprove the *Hiſtorical truth* of theſe Books, if we conſider, 1. That the fixed time of the life of *Job*, and the time to which divers Prophecies refer is not eaſily determined, which yet is no good argument againſt the truth of either: as it is a bad argument againſt the credit of ancient Hiſtory, either of our own or other Nations, that it is hard to fix the ſcituation of divers *ancient places*, mentioned by names now *unknown*.

2. That both *Joſephus* and other Hiſtorians, do make no mention of divers conſiderable things, which were certainly true, as for *Joſephus*, ſome of the Prophets, and the matter of divers Canonical Books, and ſome remarkable Hiſtories, as particularly all that referred to the framing the *Golden Calf*, are omitted by him. 3. That the ancient Chriſtians who had the uſe of divers ancient *Jewiſh Writers*, and other Hiſtories now loſt, and had thereby greater opportunity of ſearching into the Hiſtorical truth of theſe things, did eſteem them to be true Relations. *Bel and the Dragon* is cited as a true Narration, containing an example for Martyrdom, and an inſtance of the ſureneſs of Gods proviſion for them that truſt in him, by *Irenæus*, *Tertullian*, *Clemens Alexandrinus*, S. *Cyprian* and *Gr. Nazianzen* and divers others. And *Origen* particularly undertook the defence of the truth of the *Hiſtory of Suſanna* in anſwer to the Letter of *Africanus* which containeth the ſum of all the Objections againſt it, which were *fully and manifeſtly ſatisfied by Origen*, ſaith *Euſebius*. S. *Hierome* alſo wrote a Comment upon *Suſanna* and upon *Bel*, and declareth *Origen* to have written upon the ſame. And S. *Hierome* calling theſe *fabulæ*, uſeth that

V. Lit. Africanum in Crit. Sacr. Tom. 8. p. 46, 47.

Euſ. Hiſt. Eccl. l. 6. c. ult.

that word here as he doth elſewhere (*V. Epiſt. ad Caſtrutium*) for true Narrations which we alſo ſometimes call *ſtories*; and theſe very things he particularly acknowledgeth for truths. *Apol.* 2. *ad Ruff. & Proleg. in Habbacuc. ad Chromatium.* And *Judith* is propounded as a true Narration and example of love to her people or courage, by *Hierome*, *Origen*, *Tertullian*, *Clemens Alexandrinus*, and even by *Clemens Romanus* the Companion of S. *Paul* in that his undoubted Epiſtle to the *Corinthians*. And theſe teſtimonies are the more conſiderable, becauſe ſeveral of theſe Writers, and particularly *Tertullian*, *Clemens Alexandrinus*, *Origen* and *Hierome*, were men of great knowledge in all ancient learning. Whereforethere is very conſiderable evidence that theſe relations are true Hiſtories, though it would be inconſiderable matter of Objection, if they were acknowledged to be only *Parables*.

Clem. Ep. ad Corinth. p. 70.

3. *Obj.* 2. Judith *approveth the fact of* Simeon *againſt the Sichemites, by deſiring the like aſſiſtance from God*, Ch. 9. and *ſpake things untrue*, Ch. 10. v. 12, 13, 14. and Ch. 11. and yet *ſhe was commended highly, and bleſſed by* Joacim *and the Elders. Anſ.* Both in theſe Books and even in the Canonical Scriptures, we muſt diſtinguiſh between things *Hiſtorically related*,

ted, which are many times evil; and the *matters of precept and command* which are always good. The main design of this Book of *Judith*, being to shew Gods wonderful Providence in preserving his Church; divers things are mentioned in the carriage of *Judith*, which are neither to be allowed in her, nor imitated by us. And *in the Canonical Scriptures* we read of good men uttering expressions in Prayer, which were unadvised and blameable; such were *Elijahs intercession against Israel*, and both his and *Jonah's* passionate desire of Death. We also read of *Jacob* by false speeches procuring his Fathers blessing, which were allowed by *Rebecca*; and of the contrivance of *Jacobs* other Sons against *Joseph*, with their lying devices to palliate their own sin, and of the like wiles which *Jehu* used to destroy the Worshippers of *Baal*; and in some things both *Jehu and Judith* deserved commendation, but in other things their practices (as the other now mentioned and divers more) are not examples for our imitation, but rather warnings to us to take heed of the like miscarriages.

4. *Obj.* 3. From *Tobit* there are divers things objected. (Of what is said against any thing contained in the fifth Chapter, which is purposely left out of our Kalendar,

dar, I ſhall take no notice.) But *Ch.* 6. 9, 10. *The uſing the heart and liver of a Fiſh is declared* (as from an Angel) *to be a Cure for one vexed with an evil Spirit, and the Gall thereof to be a remedy for the whiteneſs of the eyes.* Concerning which place two ways of interpretation are propounded by *Druſius*: the one that theſe words concern a *Diſeaſe* or diſtemper of body, occaſioned by the operation or influence of an evil ſpirit, which yet may be healed by natural remedies, which the Angel did direct; and he ſheweth that ſome parts of fiſhes are reputed to have medicinal vertue; and it is ordinarily acknowledged that ſome diſtempers curable by Medicine may be promoted by evil ſpirits. But the *other* which I chiefly embrace is to this purpoſe, that it is no ways improbable, that God who more frequently manifeſted himſelf by *Angels* before the coming of Chriſt, ſhould by the Miniſtry of one of them, vouchſafe an extraordinary help and cure, to one who religiouſly ſerved him, though by the uſe of means otherwiſe inconſiderable, that his mercy and mighty power ſhould be manifeſted, by the effecting ſuch a Cure. By waſhing in *Jordan*, according to the Prophets direction, the Leproſie of *Naaman* was miraculouſly

Druſ. in Tob. 6.

miraculouſly cleanſed; by waſhing in *Siloam* at our Saviours command, the blind man obtained a wonderful Cure. So ſmall a thing as *Moſes his rod* ordered by Gods power, was an inſtrument of working divers miracles, and by *Elijah's Mantle* ſmiting the Waters, they were twice divided, 2 *Kin.* 2. 8, 14. and in *Egypt* at the ſprinkling of bloud the deſtroying Angel paſſed over. Now can any man think it either impoſſible, or altogether incredible, that God ſhould produce great effects by ſmall appearances, at the *direction of an Angel*, who had oft done the like at the *direction of a Prophet*? And this direction of the Angel is manifeſtly deſigned, for a particular preſervation to *Tobit*, and a Cure to his Father, and the following Chapters declare the effect of both: nor ought it to be doubted, but that our great and eternal God hath done many *great things*, beſides what was thought neceſſary to be expreſſed in the Canonical Scriptures.

5. *Obj.* 4. In the ſixth, ſeventh, and ninth Chapters of *Tobit*, the Angel who is ſaid to Accompany him, is ſpoken to under the *name of Azarias* (*viz.* the Son of *Ananias*) and ſeemeth to *own that name, whereas it could not be true that the Angel was this Azarias.* But here it muſt be

be conſidered, that it is the uſual practice even of the Holy Scriptures, to call Angels by the name of ſuch as they repreſent or reſemble. The two Angels that came to *Sodom* in the appearance of men, are called אנשים *men*, *Gen.* 19. 12. The Angel that appeared to *Manoah*'s Wife, being asked if he was האיש *the man* who appeared to the Woman, declared that he was, *Judg.* 13. 11. The Angel in the Sepulchre, who gave tidings of the reſurrection of Chriſt, is called νεανισκος *a young man*, *Mar.* 16. 5. and the two Angels who appeared at the Aſcenſion of our Lord, are called by S. *Luke* ἀνδρες *men in white apparel*, *Act.* 1. 10. Now it is not agreeable to religious piety, to condemn ſuch ways of expreſſion as evil and ſinful, which are allowed in the holy word of God; nor is it unſeemly for an *holy Angel*, to own that manner of expreſſion, which the holy Spirit himſelf uſeth. And beſides this, that which is hinted by *Eſtius* may well be admitted, that the name of *Azarias the Sun of Ananias*, might be taken by the Angel upon himſelf, to expreſs by the ſignification of theſe names, what was the buſineſs he came to effect, (*Azarias* ſignifying the help of God, and *Ananias* the grace and favour of God) that by the Angel the *help of God* was vouchſafed,

V. Ambr. de Abr. Patr. l. 1. c. 6. Druſ. in Gen. 18. 3. V. Gen. 18. 2. 16. 22.

Eſtius in loc. diffic. Scrip. in Tob.

vouchſafed, which is the effect of the *favour of God.*

6. *Obj.* 5. The laſt Objection from *Tobit* and the moſt conſiderable is, *Tob.* 12. 15. Where the Angel is reported to ſay, *I am* Raphael *one of the ſeven holy Angels, which preſent the prayers of the Saints, and go in and out before the glory of the holy one.* For the clearing of this place; touching the Phraſe of the *ſeven holy Angels*, (which yet is neither in *Munſters* Hebrew Copy of *Tobit*, nor in the Syriack) it may be taken for an indefinite number as the like Phraſe is uſed, *Mat.* 12.45. And Mr. *Mede*'s Notion is known, who aſſerteth it as an evident truth in his judgment, (and for which he giveth conſiderable proof) that there are only *ſeven principal Angels* or *Arch-Angels*, to which theſe words refer. But whether theſe words be underſtood definitely for ſeven only, or indefinitely for an uncertain number, we have the like expreſſion in the Canonical Scripture, *Zec.* 4. 10. *Rev.* 5. 6.

Mede Diſc. on Zech. 4. 10.

7. What is here ſaid concerning *Angels preſenting the Prayers of the Saints*, this being a point of truth or matter of belief, may not be received (according to the judgment both of the ancient Church and our preſent Church) upon the authority

thority of an Apocryphal Book, further than it is grounded upon the evidence of the Canonical Scripture, and in ſuch a ſenſe only as is agreeable to the doctrine of thoſe holy Scriptures. Indeed if theſe words be acknowledged to be *the words of an holy Angel*, as they are related in this Book according to ſome verſions, then muſt they be as certainly true, as if they had been ſpoken *by a Prophet or Apoſtle*. But admitting that an holy Angel did converſe with *Tobit*, yet might his words be either miſapprehended, or in this paſſage miſrepreſented. And that they are ſo may be hence with ſome probability conjectured, becauſe in this place *Tob.* 12. 15. there is no mention of *Angels preſenting the Prayers of the Saints*, either in the *Hebrew Copy* of *Munſter* or *Fagius*, or in the *Syriack* Verſion, or in the *Latin* which S. *Hierome* tranſlated out of the *Chaldee*, but it is only expreſſed in the *Greek*, which our Tranſlation followeth; and this very place was above 1400. Years ago thrice cited by *Cyprian*, without this clauſe on this manner, *Ego ſum Raphael unus ex ſeptem Angelis Sanctis, qui adſiſtimus & converſamur ante claritatem Dei.* Indeed in the twelfth Verſe, both according to the Greek, the Hebrew, and the Latin, the Angel ſpake of his

Cyp. de Orat. Domin. & de Mortalitate Adv. Jud. l. 1. n. 20.

his bringing the remembrance of their Prayers before the holy one, but even there the *Syriack* mentioneth no ſuch thing.

8. But becauſe theſe words are in our verſion; and taken in a *reſtrained ſenſe* have been ordinarily admitted as a truth, by divers ancient Chriſtian Writers, I ſhall give a double account, in what ſenſe theſe words may be taken agreeably to the *Canonical Scriptures*, and the anciently received Doctrine in the Chriſtian Church, who owned not the Angels as Mediators, nor did allow that Prayers ſhould be put up to Angels. 1. They judged that the holy Angels who are frequently preſent with us, *do join in our Religious worſhip and Prayers to God*; and as all who join in Prayers do preſent thoſe Prayers to God, ſo particularly do the holy Angels, who enjoy a nearer Communion with God than we have yet attained. So *Origen* who expreſly declareth *againſt praying to Angels*, or to any who do themſelves ſupplicate, addeth afterward that the Chriſtians particular Angel, εὐχὰς ἀναφέρει συνευχόμενος *preſenteth the Prayers joining in them*; and in another place of the ſame Book, ſaith, *that many myriads of Angels* εὐχομένοις τῷ Θεῷ συνεύχονται *do join in Prayer with them who pray*

Cont. Celſ. l. 5. *p.* 233, & 238.

Lib. 8. *p.* 401.

P. 420.

V. D. Hammond Annot. in 1 *Cor.* 11. 10.

pray to God. And as holineſs diſpoſeth an Angel to be ever ready to join in glorifying God, ſo love maketh them ready to deſire our good, ſince there is joy in the preſence of the Angels of God over one ſinner that repenteth. And S. *John* in his Viſion of the Churches worſhip declareth the *holy Angels about the Throne to join in their* Amen *thereto*, Rev. 7. 10, 11, 12. *Luk.* 15. 10.

9. 2. That the *holy Angels* being Gods Meſſengers as their name imports, are both *Miniſters of conveying much good to us from God*, which divine Providence could beſtow without their Miniſtry, and of *repreſenting our ſtate and deſires to God* as his Servants and our friends, which are fully and immediately manifeſt to God who is Omniſcient. And this may be performed partly as they are teſtifiers and witneſſes of our actions, with deſire of our good, and ſuch S. *Aug.* judgeth them certainly to be, and S. *Paul* giveth *Timothy* a charge *before the elect Angels*, 1 *Tim.* 5. 21. and ſpeaketh of their preſence in the Church, 1 *Cor.* 11. 10. and if Satan be the accuſer of the brethren before God, *Rev.* 12. 10. the holy Angels may well be thought truly to repreſent what is good: and partly as they are *miniſtring ſpirits* attending on God and *Ad fr. in Erem. Serm.* 68.

and desiring our good, they declare our Prayers not as Mediators but as Ministers, *non quia Deum doceant* (as S. *Aug.* expresseth) *sed quia voluntatem ejus super his consulunt*, desiring to know what commands God will give them to Minister for our good according to our Petitions. This sense is oft expressed by S. *Augustin*, and in the Book under his name *De diligendo Deo*, and seemeth well to agree with the expressions of others of the ancient Fathers, and with the notion of the *ancient Jews* as it is mentioned by *Philo*: and thus much seemeth to be included in these words of the New-Testament, Heb. 1. 14. *Are they not all ministring spirits, sent forth to minister for them who shall be Heirs of Salvation*, and Mat. 18. 10. *Take heed that you despise not one of these little ones, for I say unto you that their Angels do always behold the face of my Father which is in Heaven.* And this notion expresseth an honorable ministration of the holy Angels, which hath respect to the Church of God, but doth not allow them (as S. *Aug.* would not) to be accounted Mediators, nor to receive Religious worship from us; but to be honoured by us *Charitate non servitute* by an high degree of respectful love, but not by Religious service and subjection.

Ep. 120. *c.* 29. *Ep.* 121. *c.* 9.

Phil. de Plant. Noë. & de Gigantibus.

De Civ. Dei l. 9. *c.* 15.

De Ver. Relig. c. 55.

10. As

10. As to that paſſage of *Eccluſ.* 46. 20. which mentioneth *Samuel prophecying after his death*, it is ſufficient here to obſerve, that that part of the Chapter is by our Kalendar directed to be omitted. And from all this it may appear, that nothing is in our ſervice appointed to be read out of the *Apocrypha*, which being rightly underſtood is any way hurtful, or of ill influence upon practice. Yet it is to be further noted, that he who ſhall acknowledge that there is much good contained, and no evil or ſin adviſed in any of the Apocryphal Books, is ſtill far from admitting them to be *equal to the Canonical Scriptures.* For though there may be divers Books free from *actual error*; yet it is the Prerogative of the holy Scriptures alone, to be *immediately indited* by that holy Spirit who can *never err*, and to be tendered of God and received of his Church, as the perpetual and infallible *rule*, to manifeſt the will of God and the Doctrines of Faith.

SECT. VII.

Conſiderations about that Tranſlation of the Pſalms uſed in the Liturgy.

1. The next thing to be treated of is the uſe of the *Pſalms*, according to the verſion in the *Common-Prayer-Book*, concerning which, *Conſid.* 1. The uſe of this Tranſlation doth not require us to judge it the *beſt Engliſh Tranſlation*. For as formerly the ſentences out of the Pſalms, before Morning Prayer and at the Communion, were expreſſed according to another ancient and diſtinct tranſlation, ſo both the *Epiſtles and Goſpels*, and the ſentences out of the Pſalms at the beginning of Morning and Evening Prayer, are now altered according to our *laſt allowed Engliſh Tranſlation*, which alteration ſeemeth to prefer that Tranſlation as the beſt.

2. *Conſ.* 2. The Tranſlation of the Pſalms uſed in our Liturgy, is from the *Hebrew*, to which it generally agreeth, ſometimes uſing the liberty of a *paraphraſtical ſtile*. And the Hebrew being the Original is doubtleſs more pure than any Tranſlation which differeth from it. And though the *Septuagint* in the Book of

of Pſalms (which of all other hath been of moſt frequent publick uſe in the Chriſtian Church) doth vary leſs from the Hebrew, than in any other *Poetical Book* of holy Scripture, yet a Catalogue may be given of at leaſt *an hundred and fifty places*, wherein the *Septuagint* differeth from the Hebrew (not in any Chriſtian Doctrine, but in the manner of expreſſing the ſenſe of thoſe Texts) in all which the *verſion in the Liturgy* accordeth with the Hebrew, and diſſenteth from the *Septuagint*. Indeed in ſome phraſes and clauſes our verſion followeth the *Septuagint*, where the matter is unblameable: and three *entire verſes* which are not in the *Hebrew*, *Chaldee*, or *Syriack*, are in the fourteenth Pſalm added in this Engliſh Verſion, according to the ordinary Copies of the 70, and of many (but as *Grotius* intimateth not all) of the *Æthiopick*, *Vulgar Latin* and *Arabick*, and which are not in the Greek *Manuſcript from Alexandria*: but theſe Verſes being the ſame with what is cited by the Apoſtle out of the Old Teſtament, *Rom.* 3. 12, 13,--18. cannot be diſallowed as to the matter of them, and the Pſalms in the Liturgy being chiefly uſed as *Hymns of praiſe*, or our words of bleſſing God (agreeably to the practice of

Grot. in Pſ. 14.

the Jewiſh and ancient Chriſtian Church) may well admit in that uſe of ſuch a varation from the *Hebrew* Text.

3. If we obſerve the practice of the ancient Chriſtian Churches, we ſhall find, that the *Greek Church* publickly uſed the Pſalms according to the *Septuagint*, and the *Latin*, *Arabian*, and *Æthiopick* Churches, had their Pſalms of publick uſe tranſlated from the *Septuagint*, or with a little tincture from *Lucian* the Martyr, wherein they alſo followed ſome evident corruptions of the Greek Copies, as the *Arabick* in admitting ὑέων *Pſ.* 17. 14. the *Æthiopick* in reading παλαιὰς for παλαισὰς *Pſ.* 39. 5. and the *Vulgar* in tranſlating ἐν ἐλέῳ in ſtead of ἐν ἐλαίῳ. The *Syriack Verſion* was tranſlated out of the Hebrew, but hath ſuffered ſome alterations by being reviſed according to the *Septuagint*, from whence among other things it received its frequent uſe of Διάψαλμα; but this Verſion hath many imperfections, as chiefly its leaving out ſometimes *a whole verſe*, as in *Pſ.* 34. 9. and ſometimes *ſome part* thereof, as *Pſ.* 58. 9. The *reſult of this conſideration* is this, that the Pſalms publickly uſed in the *Church of England*, are more fully agreeing to the Original Hebrew, than any of thoſe known Verſions were, which were uſed

V. P. Pithœum de Latin. Biblior. Interprit.

Pſ. 92. 10.

uſed in the ancient Chriſtian Churches; and he who thinketh that he may not lawfully *join or miniſter* in the Church of *England*, becauſe of our uſe of this verſion of the Pſalms, might have diſcerned greater cauſe *in this very particular*, to have kept him at a greater diſtance from all the famous *ancient Chriſtian Churches* in the World.

4. *Conſ.* 3. The particular places moſt *blamed* in this Verſion of the Pſalms, do afford no ſufficient cauſe, when our ſuperiours enjoin the uſe of this Tranſlation, to withhold our *hearty conſent* thereto. I ſhall inſtance in three places which are chiefly urged. 1. One is *Pſ.* 106. 30. where this Tranſlation readeth it, *then ſtood up Phinees and prayed: and ſo the Plague ceaſed.* But the Verſion in our Bibles rendreth it, *Then ſtood up Phinehas and executed judgment.* The word in the Hebrew is יפלל, the Verbs of which Root being moſt uſed in the form *Hithpahel*, do generally ſignifie *to pray*, and in this form of *Pihel* they are rarely uſed, and do ſometimes ſignifie *judging* or *the judge interpoſing* between men and men to end their ſtrife. But in this place the *Chaldee Paraphraſt*, and the *Syriack Interpreter* (who both of them tranſlated from the Hebrew and well underſtood it)

render it *Phinees ſtood up and prayed.* And *Buxtorf* in his Hebrew Concordances citeth this verſe twice under the different ſignifications of the ſame root, once as expreſſing *Phinees praying*, and afterwards as expreſſing him *executing judgment.*

Buxt. Conc. Hebr. in פלל.

5. If we compare this place with the Hiſtory to which it relateth, *Num.* 25. we there find the Congregation of *Iſrael*, and *Phinehas the Son of Eleazar* the Prieſt, in a deep humiliation *weeping before the Tabernacle of the Congregation. v.* 6. Which ſolemn weeping was no doubt accompanied with the Prayers of the Prieſt, as was directed and commanded in a like caſe, *Joel* 2. 17. *Let the Prieſts, the Miniſters of the Lord weep between the Porch and the Altar, and let them ſay ſpare thy people, &c.* and in its own nature Religious weeping doth include Confeſſion and Prayer. Then we find *Phinehas v.* 7, 8. *ſlaying Zimri and Cozbi* in their Adultery, which was *his executing judgment* according to the particular commandment given, *v.* 5. and this was an act of his zeal, which accompanying his Humiliation, Prayer, and Confeſſion, did render them more acceptable alſo: and beſides this, very probably *Phinehas* either *offered incenſe*, (as *Aaron* did

to

to *make atonement* in the like Caſe of the Plague, *Num.* 16. 46, 47.) or *Sacrifice*, becauſe *v.* 12. he is ſaid to *have made an atonement* (which is a Prieſtly action) *for the Children of Iſrael*: and that all ſuch Offerings and Sacrifices did enclude *Prayer*, hath been above in ſome part obſerved. And by *Phinehas* his *zeal* (which might well be expreſſed in all theſe things, and chiefly in his ſlaying *Zimri* and *Cozbi*) and by his *executing judgment*, and *making atonement*, the wrath of God was turned away from *Iſrael*, *Num.* 25. 8, 11, 13. Now the *Septuagint* in this place of the Pſalms uſe the ſame word ἐξιλάσατο, which they uſed *Num.* 25. 13. for *Phinehas making the atonement*, as if the Pſalmiſt had ſpecial reference thereunto. And indeed all *Phinehas* his acting whereby *he interpoſed* between God and the *Iſraelites* to ſtop his wrath, may well be intended and encluded in this word ויפלל in this Pſalm: and therefore as it is well tranſlated *he executed judgment*, ſo it is not blameably rendred, *he prayed*, neither of theſe being the whole, and both of them being parts of what *Phinehas* did *in interpoſing*. And I ſuppoſe all Chriſtians will acknowledge, that *devout Prayer* with reference to the *atonement*, accompanied with *true repen-* Sect. 1. n. 7.

tance and *real reformation*, is a very effectual means to *appeaſe* the diſpleaſure of God; and it is certain, that together with true repentance the *Prayer of the Prieſt* in a ſolemn Aſſembly was directed, under a promiſe of obtaining the favour and pity of God, *Joel* 2. 17, 18.

6. Another place is *Pſ.* 58. 8. which this Verſion in the Liturgy rendreth, *Or ever your Pots be made hot with Thorns, ſo let indignation vex him even as a thing that is raw*: and this by the Non-Conformiſts in King *James* his time was cenſured for *a tranſlation ſenſeleſs and abſurd*. They who have better conſidered *the Original* in this place, acknowledge it a difficulty to clear the manner of its expreſſion: our laſt and beſt Engliſh Tranſlation expreſſeth it thus, *He ſhall take them away as in a Whirlwind both living and in his wrath*: which yet doth not clear all the difficulty in the expreſſion of the Original. It is manifeſt from the context, that this verſe encludeth a reſemblance of the *ſpeedineſs of Gods judgments* coming down upon the wicked; which according to this Verſion in the Liturgy, ſhall be as the ſnatching of fleſh which is yet raw, out of the Pot ſet on a fire of Thorns, which is torn in pieces and

and devoured greedily in a time of famine, even before it hath felt the heat of the fire: and this explication and manner of reſolving the words and phraſes of the *Hebrew*, is owned by *Vatablus*, and divers good Expoſitors; and this general ſenſe of them relating to the ſwift deſtruction of the ungodly, is the *undoubtedly true meaning* and intent of this place; but as to the manner of the explication and unfolding of the Original phraſes, among the very great variety of conjectures, it is hard to ſay which is to be *preferred before all the reſt*. But this tranſlation is ſo far from being (as it hath been charged) *ſenſeleſs and abſurd*, that it is certainly agreeing to the *true ſenſe, intent and deſign of the Pſalmiſt*.

7. But no place is more inſiſted on, than *Pſal.* 105. 28. where the Pſalmiſt ſpeaking of Gods wonderful work againſt *Egypt*, ſaith ולא מרו (according to our laſt Engliſh Verſion and divers others) *they rebelled not againſt his word*; that is, either *Moſes* and *Aaron*, or the *Iſraelites*; or as *Junius* and *Tremellius* underſtand it, his ſigns rebelled not againſt his word. But the Verſion in our Liturgy, agreeably to the greateſt number of *Latin* Copies in S. *Auguſtins* time, and to the *Septuagint*, *the Arabick and Æthiopick*,

Aug. in Pſ. 104.

pick, and to the laſt Greek Verſion in the *Octopla*, and alſo to the *Syriack*, expreſſeth it, *they were not obedient unto his word*, underſtanding this Verſe to aim at the *Egyptians* (of whom the Pſalmiſt was ſpeaking) continuing diſobedient under the mighty ſigns and works of God; which ſenſe containeth an *evident truth*, and very ſuitable to the Hiſtory, and clearly reconcileable to the Hebrew, if הלא be admitted to enclude an interrogation as the ſame word doth, *Ex.* 8. 26. and as divers other like phraſes are conceived to do, as our Learned *Fuller* hath obſerved. And theſe words, *and did they not rebel againſt his word?* are of the ſame import with theſe, *they were not obedient to his word.*

Miſcel. l. 3. c. 10.

8. And they who are verſed in the variety of Tranſlations do well know, that ſeveral particular expreſſions of Scripture, upon different accounts are by ſome rendred in the *negative*, and by others in the *affirmative*, and yet both of them are conſiſtent with the Principles of Religion; and neither of thoſe Tranſlations can thence be condemned as hurtful or uſeleſs. For inſtance, we with almoſt all other Verſions, read 2 *Kin.* 8. 10. *thou maiſt certainly recover*, but *Junius* in his latter Editions, altering the ſenſe of his

his former, *Non omnino revaleſces.* Where we, *Gen.* 2. 5, 6. with moſt other Verſions expreſs, there was not a man to till the ground. *But there went up a miſt from the earth. Junius* and *Tremellius* agreeing with the Arabick Verſion (which in the *Pentateuch* is tranſlated frow the Hebrew) render it, there was not a man to till the ground: *nor a miſt that went up out of the earth.* Yet here is no difference about any matter of Doctrine, or rule of life, but only about the time of the firſt miſt, into which no man hath ſo clear a ſight, as to ſee further than the light of this Text will diſcover. Divers other inſtances may be obſerved, ſuch as in the Syriack tranſlation reading *Pſ.* 7. 11. *God is not angry every day*; to which the Greek agreeth; and in the Syriack, and Arabick, which in the Hiſtorical Books tranſlateth from the Syriack expreſſing, 2 *Kin.* 18. 27. *That they may not eat their own dung,* (which ſenſe is well allowed by a learned man of our own Nation;) and in the *Septuagint* with the vulgar Arabick and Æthiopick who are guided byit, rendring *Pſ.* 35. 20. *They ſpake peace to me*; and alſo in the Samaritan tranſlating, *Gen.* 41. 16. *God will not give anſwer without me.* The difference of divers tranſlations may be

Mr. *Thorn. Epiſ. l.* 1. *c.* 32.

be noted in ſuch places as theſe, *Num.* 11. 25. where ſome have, *They did not ceaſe*, and others, *They did not proceed*; and in *Job* 34. 30. *Deut.* 20. 19. and *Deut.* 21. 12. Where ſome read, *She ſhall pare or cut off her nails*, others, *She ſhall nouriſh her nails or ſuffer them to grow*; and our laſt Engliſh Tranſlation doth in the Text embrace the former, and in the margent the latter; but it would be a great folly thence to conclude that that Tranſlation of the Bible is either *uſeleſs or hurtful.* See the like, 2 *Kin.* 19. 25. *Pſ.* 121. 1. Yet the various ways of rendring ſome particular expreſſions of Scripture, where it may be difficult to *determine* that *ſenſe* which muſt *exclude* all other, is very far from acknowledging the ſenſe of Scriptures uncertain, in matters of Faith and Chriſtian life; which are frequently and manifeſtly therein *expreſſed*; and to which the general conſent of the pureſt times of Chriſtianity (and in matters of life the very principles of Reaſon and Conſcience) do agree. All that can be hence concluded, is, that there is ſufficient matter in divers paſſages of Scripture, for the *exerciſe* of the learnedeſt Criticks and greateſt Students, as there is abundant *plainneſs of inſtruction* in the moſt

moſt neceſſary things for the meaneſt capacities.

SECT. VIII.

Of Holy-days, or Feſtival-days.

1. Theſe days are acknowledged to have no particular *divine* inſtitution, but have been allowed and *appointed by the Church of God*, and are eſtabliſhed by the *civil Sanctions* of our laws. The end of their appointment is, for the *promoting the ſervice of God and Religious exerciſes*, as is at large expreſſed in that Statute, by which they were particularly confirmed, and in the Queens Injunctions, and in the Book of Canons; which requireth them to be employed in *hearing Gods word read and taught, in private and publick Prayers, in acknowledging our offences to God, and amendment of the ſame, in being reconciled to our neighbours where there hath been diſpleaſure, in oft receiving the Communion, in viſiting the poor and ſick perſons, and uſing all ſober and godly converſation.* If ſuch fruits of Chriſtian Piety were more plentifully and abundantly brought forth, they would by their pleaſant ſweetneſs both recommend themſelves, and thoſe times and ſeaſons,

5, & 6 Edw. 6. 3.

Injunct. n. 20. Can. 13.

ſeaſons, the good uſe of which, more eſpecially contributed to their ripeneſs and maturity.

2. Now theſe Duties being the *principal buſineſs* of the Chriſtian life, it muſt either be aſſerted that no particular time may be peculiarly ſet apart thereto, unleſs it can be proved that God hath particularly inſtituted that time, which is an evil Principle whereby men would be taught to *reject* daily *Chriſtian exerciſes*, and to live in diſobedience to Gods commands, and in much impiety and irreligion: or elſe it muſt be granted (which is truth) that God having commanded theſe Duties, doth both *allow and expect*, that fit and ſeaſonable times in the whole courſe of life, be allotted to the practice thereof; whence ſome *portions of every day*, and ſome *eſpecial days*, may be profitably and advantageouſly imployed, in theſe Religious exerciſes. And ſuch times may allowably be called *Holy hours and days*, from the holy actions of Gods Service and Religion, for which they are reſerved, and to which they are appointed. For that is properly holy which is *ſet apart to God*; and alſo according to *Cl. Alexandrinus* πᾶς χρόνος ἱερὸς ἐν ᾧ τις τὸ θεῖον καταλαμβάνοιτο, all that is a holy time in which we receive the knowledge of God: but the

2 *Kin.* 12. 18.

Clem. Alex. Strom. l. 2.

the uſe of the word *Holiday* is no more but the ancient *Engliſh* and *Saxon* word for Church-feſtivals.

3. But whereas many perſons *miſpend* theſe days in vanity and intemperance, which by the direction of the Church and the preſcription of the Law, ought to be (and by others are) *uſed piouſly and devoutly*: theſe mens miſcarriage condemneth their *abuſe*, but not the *appointment* of theſe times to other good ends and purpoſes. The Jews in *Iſaiahs* time, abuſed their faſting days in hypocriſie and to wicked ends, *faſting for ſtrife and envy, and to ſmite with the fiſt of wickedneſs*, *Iſa.* 58. 4. and yet the appointing *faſting days* to a better end, was not only allowed at other times, but even in his time alſo in *Iſa.* 22. 12. Indeed the corruptions of many men are prone to make a bad improvement of the beſt things; The *three ſolemn Feaſts* of the Jews, in which all their Males muſt appear before the Lord, were through their abuſe of them acknowledged by their own *Talmud* to be become קבא רשתא *the Ulcer of the year.* The *Feaſts of Purim* were religiouſly appointed, though amongſt the debauched Spirits of the Jews they were turned into meer *Bacchanalia* or voluptuouſneſs and vanity. And the want of care in many

Tract. Kiddush.

Buxtorf. Lex. Rab. in בסם

many perſons of the Service of God upon the Lords days, hath adminiſtred juſt cauſe for that great complaint in our Homilies, *That God is greatly diſhonoured and the Devil ſerved upon that day.* And in my apprehenſion it is not improbable, that the *oppoſition* maintained againſt the obſerving theſe Holidays, may have this forcible influence upon many, who are eaſily *withheld* from good, but hardly *perſwaded* to it, to make them the more neglectful therein of *Religious exerciſes.*

Hom. of time and place of Prayer. Part. 1.

4. It was the practice of the *Jewiſh Church*, and was in many inſtances allowed by the holy Scriptures, to *ſet apart voluntarily* ſome days for Religious Service, which God had not particularly enjoyned. I might mention their *uſual Faſts* of the firſt-born before the Paſſover, and their *Faſts* after the days of unleavened bread, and after *Pentecoſt*. The annual Faſts for many years of the *fourth*, *fifth*, *ſeventh*, and *tenth months* are mentioned by the Prophet *Zechariah* (*Zech.* 8. 19.) We read alſo of a particular *Faſt proclaimed by Jehoſaphat*, 2 *Chron.* 20. 3. and of another in *Joſiahs* time, *Jer.* 36. 9. and another commanded by *Ezra*, *Ezr.* 8. 21. and of *a three days Faſt* appointed by *Eſther*, which the Chaldee Paraphraſt with ſome probability obſerved, to be kept

kept *within the days of unleavened bread.* See *Eſth.* 3. 12. with *Chap.* 4. 8, 16. And it may be eaſily inferred, that if it be lawful to ſet *days apart* for humbling themſelves before God with *faſting and prayer*, without any particular divine Commandment; it muſt needs alſo be lawful where there is ſufficient occaſion, to appoint the like for the Service of God, with *Religious praiſe and thanksgiving*, with joy and gladneſs of heart. *Chal. par. in Eſt.* 4. 17.

5. They had alſo the *Feaſt of Purim* eſtabliſhed by the Letters of *Mordecai*, *Eſth.* 9. 21. when the *Jewes ordained and took upon themſelves to do after this writing*, *verſ.* 27. after which *Eſther and Mordecai wrote with all authority to confirm theſe days of Purim*, *verſ.* 29, 31. and it is expreſly declared that the *Decree of Eſther confirmed theſe matters of Purim*, *verſe* 32. The feaſt of *Dedication* was appointed by *Judas Maccabæus* and his Brethren, and the Children of *Iſrael*, 1 *Mac.* 4. 59. to be obſerved *annually for eight days* in remembrance of the cleanſing of the Temple from the profanations of *Antiochus*, and the reſtoring the liberty of the performing the ſervice of God therein; and at this Feaſt was our bleſſed Saviour himſelf preſent at the Temple, *Joh.* 10. 22, 23. And that the

Feaſt of Dedication was that Feaſt appointed by *Judas Maccabæus* (though ſome ancient Chriſtian Writers did otherwiſe interperet it) is proved by *Junius*, *Buxtorf*, but eſpecially and very largely and fully by Mr. *Selden*. Divers other Feaſts are mentioned in the various *Jewiſh Kalendars*, as may be ſeen in *Scaliger*, and in that *Kalendar* exhibited by Mr. *Selden*, which I ſhall not inſiſt upon. Yet it may be conſidered that *Scaliger* divideth the *Jewiſh* Feaſt into the *Legalia* or Feaſts appointed by Gods Law, and *Politica* or ſuch as were eſtabliſhed by their own conſent; and that thoſe of this laſt ſort, were ſome of them appointed *before the time of Eſdras*, and ſome *after*, of both which he undertaketh to give particular inſtances: and it is thought by Mr. *Thorndike*, that the Feaſt of the *Wood-offering*, expreſſed in the *Jewiſh Kalenders*, is referred unto in *Neh.* 10. 34. and *Chap.* 13. 31. both which places ſpeak of *the Wood-offering at the time appointed*. But the inſtances above mentioned are ſufficient to manifeſt that it was lawful under the time of the *Jewiſh* Church, to appoint days of Religious Solemnity to be *annually obſerved*, though they were not enjoyned by any divine Inſtitution. Wherefore I forbear to inſiſt upon the *ſeven days feaſt* which

De Syned. l. 3. c. 13. Sect. 7. &c.

Ibid. Sect. 12.

De Emend. Temp. l. 7.

Of Religious Aſſemblies c. 8.

Solomon

Solomon kept before the Lord, immediately before the Feaſt of Tabernacles, 1 *King.* 8. 65. 2 *Chron.* 7. 9, 10. And of the *ſeven days feaſt* in the time of *Hezekiah*, added to the ſeven days of unleavened bread, 2 *Chron.* 40. 23. Now it ſeemeth very reaſonable, that Chriſtians whoſe *mercies from God* are greater than the *Jewiſh* Church enjoyed, ſhould alſo make uſe both of *weekly and other ſet times* for the ſervice of God, it being propheſied of the *Gentile* Church under the Goſpel, *Iſa.* 66. 23. *That from one new Moon to another, and from one Sabbath to another, ſhall all fleſh come to worſhip before the Lord.*

6. After the Coming of Chriſt, as the Diſciples of *John faſted oft*, ſo our Lord declared that his Diſciples ſhould faſt after his departure. This duty was afterwards practiſed by the Apoſtles, and enjoyned to all Chriſtians, 1 *Cor.* 7. 5. and was in part exerciſed in the *ſtationary days*, of the ancient Chriſtians, two days in the week. And beſides other times, the *time of our Lords paſſion*, which *Euſebius* calleth τὸν τῦ σωτῆρος πάθους ἐορτὸν, is evidently aſſerted by him, (though he miſunderſtand ſome words of *Philo*) to have been obſerved by the Chriſtians *in the days of Philo*, and that is from the time of

Euſ. Hiſt. Ecc. l. 2. c. 17.

our *saviours death*; and to the observation of the Passion time those words of *Tertullian* do manifestly refer, (notwithstanding the divers conjectures of learned men) where he declareth the Christians appointing *jejuniis Parasceven*, and what *Origen* writeth of their observing the Παρασκευὰς which probably includeth more than a single day.

Adverſ. Pſyc. c. 14. Cont. Celſ. l. 8.

7. There is abundant testimony also of other solemn days of Religious joy besides the Lords days, to have been observed; among which *Tertullian* mentioneth the whole *fifty days from Easter to Whitsontide*, with which he saith no Religious Solemnity of the *Gentiles* could compare; and *Origen* undertaketh to justifie the *Festivals of the Christian Church* at *Easter time and Whitsontide*, and such like (besides the Lords days) not to be contained under the Apostles censure upon the *Galatians*, for their observation of days and times. And before their time the observation of some *anniversary remembrance* of eminent Martyrs is expressed in the *Martyrium S. Ignatii*, published by Bishop *Usher* from ancient Manuscripts which he judgeth to have been written by *Philo*, *Gaius*, and others, who were present at this Martyrdom, who write, *Manifestavimus vobis diem & tempus, ut secundum*

Tert. de Idol. c. 14.

Orig. Ibid.

In Appendice Ignatiana.

ſecundum tempus martyrii congregati communicemus athletæ,----glorificantes in ipſius venerabili & ſancta memoria Dominum noſtrum Jeſum Chriſtum. To the ſame purpoſe are the words of *Cyprian*, *Martyrum paſſiones & dies anniverſaria commemoratione celebramus*, and this is the ſenſe alſo of *Tertullian* his *oblationes pro defunctis, pro natalitiis annuadie facimus*; for both the Phraſe and thing of theſe ancient oblations, did particularly intend an honourable *Memorial and Communion* with the perſon. And when *Euſebius* giveth an account of the change of the Empire under *Conſtantine*, from Heatheniſm to Chriſtianity, he ſaith they then had great reſpect to the Lords day, and honoured the *days of the Martyrs*, and celebrated the *Feſtivals* received in the Church. And I ſuppoſe it needeth no proof, that the *Apoſtles and Evangeliſts* had the chief place among the *Chriſtian Martyrs*, who were the principal Teſtifiers of Chriſt, and the particular days wherein a pious remembrance of them was celebrated to the glory of God, are frequently mentioned after the end of the third Century, and are expreſſed in *Conſtit. Apoſt. l.* 8. *c.* 33. And though the *particular Feſtivals* of the Apoſtles were, according to the practice of the Church

Cyp. Ep. 34.

De Cor. Mil. c. 3.

De Vit. Conſt. l. 4. *c.* 23.

in ſeveral parts of the World, celebrated at very different times, as may appear by comparing the practice of the *Weſtern Church*, with the Conſtitution of *Alexius Comnenus*, which concerned the Eaſtern or Greek Church, and with the ſeveral *Arabick Kalendars*, two of which are exhibited by Mr. *Selden*, *de Synedr. l. 3. c.* 15. Yet in all theſe Churches (as alſo in the *Syriack*, as appeareth from the Rubricks for the Leſſons on theſe days in the Syriack Teſtament; and alſo in the *Æthiopick* and *Ægyptian* Churches, as appeareth from the *Computus Æthiopicus*, and *Computus Copticus* in *Scaliger*) they did not only allow and obſerve ſuch days as lawful, but they *appointed and owned* them as conducing to the honour and advancement of Chriſtianity, being piouſly and religionſly uſed.

De Emend. Temp. l. 7.

Rat. Diſc. c. 3.

Conf. Boh. c. 15.
Conf. Aug. c. 15.
Conf. Helv. c. 24.

8. Amongſt the Proteſtants the *Bohemian* Church, and thoſe of the *Auguſtane Confeſſion*, are very much agreeable to us in the obſervation of Feſtivals; and their approbation of theſe days not only as lawful but as uſeful and requiſite is contained in their publick Confeſſions: and the Church of *Switzerland* alloweth ſeveral ſuch days with a *Maximopere approbamus*, and the Dutch Church obſerve the *Nativity of Chriſt*, and ſome other Feſtivals

ſtivals as appeareth from their Canons, ratified by the Synod of *Dort*. Indeed the Church of *Geneva* (and that of *Scotland*, which from 1560. till 1617. did herein follow it) did not admit of any of theſe days: but this was ſo little pleaſing to *Calvin* the moſt eminent Miniſter of *Geneva*, that he writing concerning the day of our *Lords Nativity*, which was not there celebrated, ſaith, *Sancte teſtari poſſum, I can in a ſacred manner proteſt, that this thing was tranſacted, when I neither knew of it, nor had any ſuch deſire*; and he further declared, that it *was his endeavour that it might have been there obſerved*. Wherefore the laying aſide all theſe days was even in his eyes the *defect and blemiſh*, but not the perfection and beauty of that Church. *Calv. Ep. Haller.*

9. Beſides all theſe arguments from authority, to prove the allowableneſs of *Feſtival days* for *Religious exerciſe*; it may be conſidered that if it be both lawful and good, when we have received ſome eminent mercy from God, to ſet ſome *hours* or ſome particular *days apart*, to praiſe and magnifie the goodneſs of God, there is the ſame or greater reaſon, to give allowance to the obſervation of theſe *ſtated Chriſtian Feſtivals*. For I think no man can deny, that not only

the benefits flowing from the great actions of our Saviour; but even the advantages accruing to us from the *Apoſtles and Evangeliſts*, by their faithful preaching the Goſpel of Chriſt, and giving teſtimony to his Doctrine, and continuing ſtedfaſt therein unto the death, is to us more valuable and advantageous than any temporal benefit whatſoever; becauſe our enjoying the *knowledge of Chriſt* and being *Chriſtians*, which is the fruit of the Apoſtles and Evangeliſts making known the Goſpel to the World, is a greater priviledge than any outward *advantage* in the World. And the benefit of *holy exerciſes*, and of being employed in glorifying God is ſo excellent, that the uſe of particular times *appointed* for that purpoſe, ought not to be *rejected* by pious men, though ſome men do abuſe thoſe means which they ſhould emprove.

10. But it is here objected, that the fourth Commandment ſaith, *ſix days ſhalt thou work*, and S. *Paul* blameth the Galatians *for obſerving days and times, and months and years.* Concerning which places waving divers other things which might be anſwered, 1. Let the Objectors conſider, whether themſelves would be willing to admit this to be the ſenſe of either

either of theſe Texts, That it is not *lawful to ſet apart any day of the Week, either for praying, faſting, or for praiſe and thanksgiving:* if this ſenſe be allowed, they muſt then condemn not only the inſtances above mentioned both of Jewiſh and Chriſtian practice, but they muſt alſo deny them that liberty, which the Prophet *Joel* commanded them to exerciſe, *Joel* 2. 15. *ſanctify a Faſt, call a ſolemn Aſſembly*, and thereby render Gods command of none effect: but if this ſenſe of theſe Scriptures ought not to be admitted, then cannot the Religious obſervation of Feſtival days be thereby condemned. 2. Theſe words, *ſix days ſhalt thou labour*, never were to the Jews a Precept of ſuch an *unlimited* and *unbounded ſenſe*, as to admit of no other uſe of any day, but in labour. Indeed ſloth, idleneſs, and negligence were here condemned; and thoſe days allowed and appointed for labour, in this *reſtrained* ſenſe, or with this exception, *Unleſs ſome reaſonable and accountable occaſion require the contrary.* The reaſon of this reſtrained ſenſe will appear neceſſary, becauſe the ſolemn days of *Gods appointment* under the Jewiſh State, ought to be obſerved, even upon any of thoſe ſix days, though they required *ſtrict reſt* as

the

the day of atonement did: and becauſe it was alſo lawful upon a providential occaſion to employ a day in *voluntary mourning* for a ſick or dead friend, 2 *Sam.* 3. 31, 33, 35. *Ch.* 12. 16, 17. or in rejoicing for the Circumciſion of a Child, or ſuch like cauſe: and it muſt be ſtill acknowledged lawful for a Child, Servant or Subject, to employ a day upon the command of his Father, Maſter or Soveraign *in attendance upon* their *perſons*; much more might the Jews keep *a Faſt* or obſerve *a Feaſt* when *Eſther* required, and ſignal providences directed them thereto. 3. The obſerving days and times condemned, *Gal.* 4. 10. concerneth wholly the *Jewiſh ſolemnities* as S. *Aug.* and S. *Hierome* obſerve, and the ſcope of the place demonſtrateth; the obſerving which is oppoſite to Chriſtianity. Thus he who keepeth the *Jewiſh Sabbath* out of Conſcience to the *Moſaical Law* doth ſo far oppoſe Chriſtianity, and return to Judaiſm, this being a ſhadow of good things to come, *Col.* 2. 16, 17. and is condemned by S. *Paul*; but he who Chriſtianly obſerveth the *Lords-day*, acteth for the *advancement of Chriſtianity*, and the honour of Chriſt, and is not in this place blamed by the Apoſtle: And ſo he who obſerveth the *new Moons* out of

Auguſt. Cont. Adimant. c. 16.

Hier. in Loc.

of reſpect to the *Law*, ſtandeth charged with Judaizing; but he who ſetteth apart any day for *Chriſtian exerciſes*, acteth as becometh a Chriſtian; for as he is the beſt Chriſtan who is *moſt frequently* exerciſed in theſe practices; ſo he cannot be blamed who *eſpecially upon ſome days* engageth himſelf to theſe duties. So that the difference between our obſerving the Chriſtian Feſtivals and the Jewiſh, is anſwerable to the difference between Judaiſm and Chriſtianity.

11. As to that Objection, againſt the obſervation of the days of the *Annunciation* (or the Conception of our Saviour) *the Nativity, Paſſion and Aſcenſion of our Lord*; *that theſe days are at leaſt the leſs allowable, becauſe the Lords day is particularly appointed for the worſhip of God, and the honourable memorial of the great undertaking and actions of our Saviour*; it may be ſufficient to obſerve, 1. That this argument ſeemeth equally to oppoſe the ſetting apart any other Portion of time beſides the Lords day, to be purpoſely and particularly employed for the Religious worſhip of God: which would greatly *prejudice* the exerciſe of Religion; or at leaſt the inſiſting upon this objection, will not allow Chriſtians to engage themſelves, to *glorifie God for Jeſus Chriſt*, and

to

to admire the grace of Chriſt upon any other day; becauſe this would require ſome other time to be deſigned for theſe Religious actions. 2. That though the Jewiſh Sabbath had a peculiar reſpect to their *deliverance from Egypt*, *Deut.* 5. 15. Yet for that mercy (which was far inferiour to what *Chriſtians enjoy by Chriſt*) they obſerved alſo other yearly ſolemnities, eſpecially the great Feaſts of the *Paſſover*, and the Feaſt of *Tabernacles*. Wherefore though the obſervation of the Lords day, as it is one day in ſeven, encludeth a teſtimony that we *worſhip God the Creator*, who made the World in ſix days and reſted the ſeventh; and as it is the firſt day of the Week it containeth a profeſſed owning and *honouring of Jeſus Chriſt* our Lord and Saviour, who accompliſhed his humiliation and began his exaltation on that day; yet this doth by no means exclude the lawful uſe of any other time directed, either by *voluntary choice*, or *Eccleſiaſtical or political laws* for the advantage of piety in the worſhip of God, and the more ſolemn obſervance of thoſe great actions of our bleſſed Lord, which ought evermore to be had in remembrance.

CHAP.

CHAP. V.

Of the particular Offices in the Liturgy.

SECT. I.

Of the directions for Communicants receiving the Lords Supper.

1. THE firſt particular office, according to the order of the Book, is that for the *Communion*; at the end of which the Rubrick requiring *every Pariſhioner to communicate at leaſt three times in the year*, is diſliked, becauſe many perſons may not be duly qualified to receive; and therefore this Rubrick was deſired either to be *left out*, or to be altered to this ſenſe, that *the Communion ſhould be thrice in the year adminiſtred, if there be a convenient number to receive.* Now becauſe this exception is thought conſiderable, whereas indeed the Rubrick is herein not only *juſtifiable* but very *commendable*, I ſhall endeavour to clear this whole matter by theſe conſiderations. Presbyt. Excep. p. 21.

2. *Conſ.* 1. To *receive the holy Communion*

munion is a very great Chriſtian duty, and cannot be neglected without grievous ſin and the diſpleaſure of God. This may appear, by obſerving that God ſtrictly required all his Sacramental Inſtitutions to be received; when he appointed Circumciſion, he declareth concerning the uncircumciſed Manchild, that *that Soul ſhould be cut off from his people, he hath broken my Covenant*, *Gen.* 17. 14. When he ordered the uſe of the Paſs-over, he ſaid *the man that is clean, and not in a journey, and forbeareth to keep the Paſſover, the ſame ſoul ſhall be cut off from his people, becauſe he brought not the Offering of the Lord in his appointed ſeaſon; that man ſhall bear his ſin*, *Num.* 9. 13. and even this perſon who was unclean, was bound to keep the Paſſover in the next following month, *Num.* 9. 10, 11. Under the New Teſtament thoſe words, *Joh.* 3. 5. *Except a man be born of water and of the ſpirit, he cannot enter into the Kingdom of God*, are by the general teſtimony of antiquity to be underſtood concerning Baptiſm, and the Phariſees are condemned for *rejecting the Counſel of God againſt themſelves, being not baptized of John*, *Luk.* 7. 30. Now the reaſon why God was ſo greatly offended at the neglect of theſe Sacraments, is expreſſed to be,

be, becauſe he accounted this to be a diſowning or diſ-eſteeming his *Covenant*, of which his Sacraments were a ſign and ſeal, *Gen.* 17. 14. and becauſe Gods *appointment* and inſtitution therein was not obeyed, *Num.* 9. 13. *Luk.* 7. 30. Wherefore becauſe the Lords Supper doth exhibit the *New Teſtament in the blood of Chriſt*, and the partaking thereof is particularly *commanded* by Chriſt, it muſt upon the ſame reaſons be as evil and dangerous to neglect this Sacrament, as thoſe other. And if it be further conſidered, that this is a ſpecial Ordinance of eminent *Chriſtian profeſſion*, ſhewing forth the Lords death till he come, 1 *Cor.* 11. 26. and exhibiting the *Communion of the body and blood of Chriſt*, the right partaking of this Ordinance muſt needs be concluded to be a *principal action and ſervice of Chriſtianity*, whether we conſider the duty performed, or the benefits which may be thereby received.

3. If the practice of the Apoſtolical and Primitive Church be conſulted, the three thouſand converted on the day of *Pentecoſt* when the Holy Ghoſt was given, did all *continue ſtedfaſtly in the Apoſtles doctrine and fellowſhip, and in breaking of Bread and Prayer.* And the receiving the Communion was eſteemed ſo high a *Act.* 2. 42.

part

part of the Christian service in their publick Assemblies, that their assembling
Act. 20. 7. was called their *coming together to break*
Conc. Ant. *bread.* The Council of *Antioch* determi-
c. 2. ned them to *be cast out of the Church who were present at the reading of the Scriptures, but* καὶ τῷ ἀταξίαν *in a disorderly manner went away and received not the*
Can. Ap. 9. *Eucharist:* and the same was decreed in the Canons of the Apostles, and much to the same purpose in other Councils, which (as that of *Antioch*) were embraced as part of the *Code* of the Universal Church. Agreeably hereunto it was
Ign. Ep. ad Eph §. *Ignatius* his desire for the *Ephesians*, ὅτι οἱ καθ' ἕνδρα κοινῇ πάντες ἐξ ὁνόματος, *that they all of them jointly, and every one of them particularly should meet together, and partake of the same bread.* Among the Protestant Churches, the *Polonian* Synod con-
Syn. Petricov. Sect. 5. 1587. sisting of members who owned three distinct confessions, did unanimously declare, that *all Pastors ought to teach and accustom their auditors, that as oft as the Lords Table is prepared in the publick Assemblies, for the faithful, they should not neglect every one of them to come unto it.* And the vehement expressions in the *Geneva Catechism*, and in *Bucers Censura* against them who neglect to come to the Lords Supper, might be here added, with other

other teſtimonies of the ſame nature. Only it muſt be here obſerved, that Non-Conformity hath run its changes, at ſuch a variance, as if both the extreams were to be preferred to the middle way. The Author of the *Admonition* eſteemed this direction for the Communicants receiving to be *too large*, and that too much was done in directing them to Communicate, but both Mr. *Cartwright* the chief oppoſer of the Liturgy in Queen *Elizabeths* time, and the Author of the *Altare Damaſcenum*, who was the moſt violent cenſurer thereof in King *James* his time, thought that too little was done herein: for both of them would have all who are in the Churches Communion *forced*, (even by *civil puniſhments* ſaith the former, and *ſtatis temporibus omnes adigendi ſunt* ſaith the latter) *to receive the Lords Supper*, and both of them condemn them who abſtain from the Lords Table out of *fear*, as guilty of *ſuperſtition*, *and that they ought not to be born with*. But now again the Chanel is altered and the ſtream is returned to the other ſide. But by the invariable rule of the will of God, which is an unerring guide, it is the duty of all Chriſtians to *attend upon the inſtitutions of Chriſt*, which is the firſt conſideration I propound.

T. C. Reply p. 117.

Alt. Damaſc. c. 10. p. 727, 728.

4. *Conſ.* 2. The neceſſity of being *duly qualified* for the right receiving the Lords Supper, doth not leave men at all *excuſable in their ordinary forbearing:* for the danger of performing any Religious duty careleſly, is expreſſed in the holy Scriptures, to *quicken* men unto the greater piety in their attendance upon thoſe ſervices, but not to give them any liberty of *neglecting* them. That ſlothful and wicked ſervant who hid his talent in a Napkin, had at laſt no comfort by his pretended excuſe for his neglect that he looked upon his Lord *as an hard man* whom he could not pleaſe, but was *caſt into outer darkneſs.* It was no way lawful for the Aaronical Prieſts to forbear to offer the Sacrifices which God had commanded, becauſe he had declared that he *would be ſanctified in them that come nigh him*, and had deſtroyed *Nadab* and *Abihu* for their undue approach. Though God upbraided the Jews that they did *ſteal, & murder, and commit adultery*, &c. *and come and ſtand before him in his Houſe which was called by his name*; yet it was ſtill the duty of every male among them, religiouſly to preſent themſelves there before the Lord *three times in the year*, *Deut.* 16. 16. and they were all enjoined to keep the Paſſover, which encluded a-

Mat. 25. 24—30.

yielding

yielding themſelves to the Lord, 2 Chr. 30. 8. and a *preparing their heart to ſeek God*, *v.* 19. And when S. *Paul* had ſaid, that *whoſoever ſhall eat this bread and drink this Cup of the Lord unworthily ſhall be guilty of the body and blood of the Lord*, this giveth no allowance to any to neglect this Ordinance; but the next verſe directeth, *but let a man examine himſelf, and ſo let him eat of that bread and drink of that Cup*: and the following words, *For he that eateth and drinketh unworthily eateth and drinketh damnation to himſelf, not diſcerning the Lords body*; are laid down as an argument, to ſhew that men ought to *examine themſelves, and ſo to eat and drink.* 1 Cor. 11. 27,28,29.

5. He that heareth or readeth the word of God, or knoweth his will or profeſſeth the name of Chriſt, without obedience yielded thereunto, doth encreaſe his ſin and condemnation; and yet *hearing*, *reading*, *knowledge and profeſſion* of Chriſtianity are neceſſary duties: but that which is here only available and is every mans indiſpenſable duty, is, to join the life of Chriſtianity with its knowledge and profeſſion. So it is a duty to receive this Sacrament, and to be careful not to receive it *unworthily*, or ἀναξίως unſuitably

bly to its nature and inſtitution. Wherefore this Ordinance encluding under the Elements of Bread and Wine, *an Heavenly Communion of the body and blood of Chriſt*, whoſe death is here repreſented as he offered up himſelf to God for us, and eſtabliſhed the New Teſtament, with the aſſurance of all the bleſſings and promiſes thereof; the worthy receiving this Sacrament will require that *Communion* with Chriſt be both heartily deſired and piouſly embraced; that the *death* and *mediation of Chriſt* be acknowledged, as the only way of atonement and remiſſion of ſins; that the *Chriſtian Religion* eſtabliſhed in the New Teſtament or Covenant, be owned as the only true Religion, and all others rejected; that the promiſes of *eternal life, pardon and grace*, be valued and ſought after, as the chief objects of deſire and hope; and that the *Chriſtian practice* which the New Teſtament requireth be undertaken, and reſolved upon, with a circumſpect care of *repentance*, and amendment of what is amiſs, and with a peculiar reſpect to *peace and love*, by reaſon of this Sacrament of Unity; it being noted by S. *Auguſtine*, that *he who receiveth the Sacrament of Unity, and doth not hold the bond of peace, doth not*

De Conſecr. diſt. 2. c. Qui manducant.

not receive the Sacrament for his good, but as a teſtimony againſt himſelf; which was alſo the Doctrine of S. *Paul*, 1 *Cor.* 11. 17, 18. And though there be too many who do not practiſe, according to the *neceſſary rules of Chriſtianity*, it is abſolutely and indiſpenſably neceſſary for them that their lives be changed and amended, that they may not only be fit to *receive* this holy Sacrament, but that they may be fit to partake of the *bleſſing* of God, and to avoid the dreadful *miſeries* of everlaſting torments, and to live anſwerable to their *Baptiſmal Covenant*, that they may be *advantaged* by their profeſſion of Chriſtianity. And let any man conſider, whether it be not as *unreaſonable a Plea* in the ſight of God, for any man to avoid the holy Communion, becauſe he is not willing to live according to the Chriſtian rules, when both theſe things are his duty; as it would be in the ſight of a Prince, for a Subject to *refuſe* to take the *Oath of Allegiance*, upon pretence that he is enclined to undertake practices of Rebellion.

6. *Conſ.* 3. The Doctrine of our Church and its *Rules for Communion*, do not allow that any perſons ſhould come to the holy Sacrament, otherwiſe than in

a ſuitable and Religious manner: but it jointly urgeth (as the holy Scriptures do alſo) the *duty of coming*, and the *neceſſity of coming preparedly*. Amongſt our Writers Biſhop *Cranmer* declared that we *ought not unreverently and unadviſedly to approach to the Lords Table---but we ought to come to that Board of the Lord with all reverence, faith, love and charity, fear and dread*. Both Biſhop *Whitgift*, and Mr. *Hooker*, in their defence of the Order for the Communion againſt *T. C.* allow, that there may *be cauſe of preſent forbearance from this Sacrament, becauſe of unfitneſs, but this ought to be amended:* and that it is *not deſirable that men perſiſting in wickedneſs, ſhould be conſtrained to come to the Lords Supper*. But it is needleſs to add other teſtimonies, when the Communion Book it ſelf in the firſt exhortation ſaith, *If any of you be a blaſphemer of God, an hinderer or ſlanderer of his word, an adulterer, or be in malice or envy, or in any other grievous crime; repent you of your ſins, or elſe come not to that holy Table, leſt after the taking of that holy Sacrament, the Devil enter into you as he entred into Judas, and fill you full of all iniquities, and bring you to deſtruction both of Body and Soul*. Wherefore it is acknowledged in our

Def. of Cath. Doctr. of the Sacr. l. 3. c. 14.

B. Whitg. Tr. 9. c. 6. & Tr. 15. c. 2. Eccleſ. Pol. l. 5. c. 68.

our Church, that the receiving the Holy Communion is not *a right Christian action*, where it is not performed with a *Christian spirit and disposition:* and partly upon this account, and partly for the disciplinary discountenancing of wickedness, both the twenty sixth Canon and the Rubrick before the Communion, do require that *no notorious evil liver or malicious man, before their amendment be suffered to come to the Lords Table:* and consistently herewith must that Rubrick requiring *every Parishioner to communicate* be understood, so as to be exclusive of such notorious sinners until their amendment, but to urge and warn them to amend.

7. *Conf.* 4. There is just cause why Christians should be required, *at least thrice in the year*, to receive the Communion. For whereas God required all males among the Jewes to appear before him *three times in the year*, which appearing encluded their professing, owning, and engaging to serve the God of *Israel*, and their accepting and submitting to the Law of *Moses*, and the Covenant God made with *Israel*, with their expectation of the benefits thereof; it would be very unreasonable, that Christians who are *freed* from that severe yoke

of *bondage* which the Jews were under, and enjoy higher priviledges than the Jews did, ſhould come ſhort of them in our great duty of Religion; and therefore we ſhould at leaſt *ſo oft expreſs* our owning, honouring, and accepting the Goſpel-Covenant, and the ſervice of Chriſt our Lord, in the moſt ſolemn manner, approaching to this Sacrament of our Lords inſtitution.

8. Amongſt the ancient Chriſtians this Sacrament was received ordinarily *thrice in the Week*, that is, upon the *Lords* day, and the two *Stationary* days; ſome did partake thereof daily, whoſe practice S. *Aug.* would neither commend nor cenſure, but he exhorteth *them who are duly prepared to receive every Lords day*; with whom agreeth *Gennadius*, as he is cited by *Walafridus Strabo*, who further obſerveth, that they are *related to be excommunicate in the Greek Church, who paſſed two or three Lords days without receiving the Communion.* They who required the leaſt among the ancients, did ſtrictly enjoin the *communicating thrice in the year*, as beſides others the Councils of *Elvira* and *Agatha* are related to have done. Our late Engliſh Conſtitutions before the Reformation *adviſed* it thrice

Walaſ. Strab. de Reb. Eccl. c. 20.

De Conſecr. d. 2. *Seculares and omnis homo.*

in

in the year, but *inſiſted* upon once at the leaſt; and ſome Reformed Churches have *directed it four times yearly*; and without all doubt the great neglect of ſo many amongſt us, to partake of that Ordinance, is a manifeſt evidence of the *want and decay, of the ancient ſpirit of Chriſtian piety and devotion.*

Linw. prov. l. 5. Tit 16. §. 16.

SECT. II.

Of ſome other things in the Communion Office.

1. Some exceptions here tendred are ſuch, that it cannot be conceived, that the Objectors thought them at all conſiderable: ſuch is the diſliking that clauſe in the Prayer before the Conſecration, *That our ſinful bodies might be made clean by his body, and our ſouls waſhed by his moſt precious blood.* This paſſage is charged, with aſcribing agreater efficacy unto the blood of Chriſt, than to his body; whereas in truth theſe words as they are here expreſſed, do no way exclude the efficacy of his blood from waſhing our bodies, nor the ſufferings of his body from cleanſing our Souls; and thoſe words uſed at the delivery of the Elements, *The body of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, which was given*

given for thee, preſerve thy body and ſoul unto everlaſting life, and the like concerning his bloud, are a manifeſt expreſſion, that the benefits both of the body and blood of Chriſt, do redound to the ſalvation both of our ſouls and bodies.

2. But with more earneſtneſs and heat, the *Miniſters delivering the Elements to every Communicants hands*, and *uſing the form of words for the diſtribution, particularly to every one of them, is cenſured as a thing contrary to the practice of Chriſt: and the judging this to be expedient, is inſinuated to be a ſtudying to be wiſer than our Maſter, and not to be obedient to him.*

commiſſ. pap. p. 92.

V. B. Whitgift. Tr. 13. c. 1. d. 17.

This Objection was urged alſo by the Authors of the Admonition, and by Mr. *Cartwright* formerly; and the ground they build upon is this, that the holy Evangeliſts relate our Saviour in his inſtitution of the Lords Supper, to have ſaid to his Diſciples, λάβετε φάγετε *take ye, eat ye*, whence they conclude that he neither gave the elements ſingly to every one, nor uſed any particular expreſſions to every Communicant, at the delivery of the Elements. Wherefore that this may be rightly underſtood, I ſhall conſider what may be collected, concerning the manner of our Saviours *diſtribution*, and the *expreſſions* he uſed in this ordinance.

3. Touch-

3. Touching the *diſtribution of theſe Elements*, as I can find no evidence in the holy Scriptures, to ſhew that it was not particular, (which yet would have been evidently expreſſed, if it had been deſigned by our Saviour to be made a neceſſary duty, in all future Adminiſtrations of this Sacrament) ſo there are ſome expreſſions in the Scripture which ſeem to intimate the contrary. When S. *Matthew*, S. *Mark*, and S. *Luke* reciting the inſtitution of this Sacrament, relate both of the Bread and the Cup, that he *gave it to the Diſciples*, or *he gave it to them*; theſe words do more fairly and probably expreſs his giving the Elements to every one of them, than that he either only bleſſed them and ſet them before them all, or that he delivered them to one of his Diſciples to be given from one to another. And if we conſider the manner how the *chief perſon of the family* did bleſs things at the Jewiſh Paſſover, it will give ſome light hereto, it being manifeſt that our Lord did much comply with the ordinary Jewiſh Rites. According to their Cuſtoms they only *bleſſed* ſome things, and every one preſent took thereof, which was their uſage about the bitter Herbs, which required no action of the Maſter of the Feaſt, to *give or diſtribute*

Mat. 26. 26, 27. *Mar.* 14. 22, 23. *Luc.* 22. 19, 20.

bute them; but other things he both *bleſſed* and particularly *diſtributed* to every one preſent, and ſuch was their uſual practice at the eating of the Cake in the Paſſover Feaſt. The former of theſe is expreſſed by *Buxtorf* on this wiſe, that after his benediction *comedit & alios quoq; comedere jubet*, and of the latter, he ſaith *comedit & aliis quoq; porrigit*: and *Camero* citing the words of the Jewiſh ritual referring to this latter, ויתן לכלם doth well render them, *tum ſingulis dat ſeu diſtribuit*, then he giveth or diſtributeth to every one of them. To the former Cuſtom our Saviour manifeſtly complyed when he *bleſſed the Cup* before the Lords Supper, and *commanded them to take it, and divide it among themſelves*, *Luk.* 22. 17. but his practice was agreeable to the latter Cuſtom, when he *gave the Bread and the Cup* in the Lords Supper, to his Diſciples.

Syn. Jud. c. 13.

Camer. in Mat. 26. 26.

4. If we further conſider the practice of the ancient Chriſtian Church, in the purer times of Chriſtianity; it is moſt likely, that their practices were conformable to the practice of Chriſt, in the manner of *diſtribution*, and it is no way probable that they in thoſe early and purer times, did *adminiſter* the holy Sacrament contrary to Chriſts inſtitution, or otherwiſe

wise than he had delivered it. *Justin Martyr* declareth, that after the Προεστὼς *the chief person in Ecclesiastical Office, had given thanks, those who are called Deacons and Ministers, did distribute to every one that was present Bread and Wine mixed with Water:* and *Tertullian* very clearly declareth, that they received the Eucharist, *non de aliorum manibus quam præsidentium, from the hands of none other persons than those who presided in the Church.* And thus far we have plain evidence, that in these ancient times, the Lords Supper was *particularly* distributed to every Communicant, by the Ministers of the Church.

Just. Ap. 2.

Tert. de Cor. Mil. 3.

5. But the words of *Clemens Alexandrinus* are produced, as a testimony that in his time (which was the same with *Tertullians*) *the Church Officers did not distribute this Sacrament to the faithful, but only suffered every one of them to take a part thereof, according to his own choice:* he saith Ευχαριστίαν τινες διανείμαντες ὡς ἔθος, αὐτὸν δὴ ἕκαστον τοῦ λαοῦ λαβεῖν τὴν μοίραν ἐπιτρέπουσιν. The sense of whose words is this, that *some persons* (to wit Church Officers or Ministers, being here opposed to the people, and supposed to have the power of the Keys, in admitting to the Eucharist) *distributing the Eucharist* (διανείμαντες here

Commiss. pap. ubi sup.

Strom. l. 1.

not

not properly ſignifying dividing, as the Latin Tranſlation rendreth it, for the Miniſter can in no proper ſenſe be ſaid to divide the Wine into parts, of which every one may take one, but it ſignifieth diſtributing or delivering to every one the Sacrament) *do ſuffer every one of the people to take part thereof.* Now it ſeemeth a ſtrange acuteneſs from hence to conclude, that the Miniſters did not particularly diſtribute this Sacrament, becauſe the people were *ſuffered to take or receive*, as if one mans receiving was wholly inconſiſtent with anothers delivering: Whereas indeed the *particular diſtribution* of the Elements, is encluded in the true ſenſe of this place of *Clemens*, and is no ways oppoſed thereby. And this is ſufficient to clear the ancient practice of the Church herein, and to ſhew that ſo far as we can judge thereby, or by the Jewiſh Cuſtoms, or the moſt probable expreſſions of Scripture, our bleſſed Lord at his inſtitution of this Sacrament, did *deliver it particularly to every one of his Diſciples*, and even in that reſpect was alſo amongſt them as one that ſerveth.

6. I proceed now more briefly, to the conſideration of the words, which our Saviour ſpoke at the diſtribution of this Sacrament.

Sacrament. Now theſe words of command, *Take, eat,* in S. *Matthew* and *Mark*; *drink ye all of it* in S. Mat.; *and do this in remembrance of me,* in S. *Luke,* and S. *Paul,* as alſo theſe words, *this is my body which is given for you, and my blood which is ſhed for you,* are all expreſſed in the plural number, as being directed to more perſons than one. Yet conſidering that theſe holy Pen-men did in ſhort relate the inſtitution of Chriſt, ſufficiently delivering what was neceſſary for us, but not *confining themſelves to the very words he ſpake,* but to the ſenſe thereof, (which is manifeſt becauſe they all four, relate his words ſpoken at the diſtribution, differently from one another) the Evangeliſts expreſſions may well conſiſt with his *ſpeaking particularly* to every perſon; becauſe what is ſpoken *to every one,* may be briefly and ſuccinctly related as ſpoken *to them all.* And though this be not certain (which yet is the more probable from the evidence above-given, of the particular diſtribution of the Sacramental Elements, to every Communicant) let them who manage this Objection conſider with themſelves, whether they would *grant* that in other Caſes, which they *plead for* in this. We read that when our Lord gave full Commiſſion to his Apoſtles, he

ſaid

ſaid to them, *Jo.* 20. 21, 22, 23. *As my Father hath ſent me, even ſo ſend* I you, *Receive ye the Holy Ghoſt. Whoſe ſins ye remit they are remitted unto them, and whoſe ſins ye retain they are retained:* and yet I ſuppoſe no ſober ſpirited man will from hence infer, that where divers perſons are at one time to receive Orders, that no ſolemn words of ordination may lawfully be expreſſed to *each perſon, particularly and diſtinctly*, but that they ought to be ſpoken to them all together, *generally and jointly*. Our Saviour alſo commanded his Diſciples, *Mat.* 28. 19. *to teach all Nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghoſt:* but will any Chriſtian think it hence deducible, that where divers perſons, or great numbers are to be baptized together, the ſolemn words of baptizing them *in the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghoſt*, may not lawfully be expreſſed ſeverally to every perſon? And if the *baptiſmal form of words* may be ſolemnly and ſuitably to that Sacrament, applyed to every perſon baptized, by the general acknowledgment of all Chriſtians, there can be no reaſon why the like may not be allowed in the Lords Supper. Wherefore the practice of our Church herein is no way *unſuitable*

ſuitable to the inſtitution of Chriſt, or the nature of this Sacrament, and the alteration of it would be for the *worſe*, and to the *abating* the ſolemnity of its Adminiſtration.

7. Concerning the Communion, I ſhall only further conſider that Rubrick, which directeth, *that if any of the Bread and Wine that was conſecrated do remain, it ſhall not be carried out of the Church, but the Prieſt, and ſuch other Communicants as he ſhall then call unto him, ſhall immediately after the bleſſing, reverently eat and drink the ſame.* Now this is ſuppoſed by ſome, to give too high an honour to the Sacramental Elements, even after the Communion is ended: to which I anſwer, 1. That all *ſuperſtitious* or other *ſinful honour of the Elements*, muſt be founded in the embracing thoſe *falſe apprehenſions*, and corrupt Doctrines which our Church rejecteth: and he who nouriſheth ſuch corrupt opinions (which none can do unleſs he forſake the truth, and the Doctrine of our Church) might have more opportunity for ſuch corrupt practices, by the Elements being *carried out* of the Church, than by their being *eaten and drunk* in it. 2. That our Church doth ſufficiently diſtinguiſh the *eating and drinking the undiſtributed Elements*, from

the Communion it ſelf, both by the formerly allowed uſe of them, and by the appointing them to be *eaten and drunk after the bleſſing*, which endeth the *office of the Communion*, and by expreſſing them under the name of *Bread and Wine which was conſecrated*. Such remaining Elements have been variouſly diſpoſed of: *Evagrius* relateth it as τὸ πάλαιον an *ancient cuſtom at* Conſtantinople, *that they were ſent to the Children at School to be received by them, as an acknowledgment of the Chriſtian Religion*; before the Council of *Laodicea*, they were ſometimes ſent to other Churches, as *Eulogiæ and tokens of Communion with them*; but this (as ſome other ways of reſerving them) was found to be of ill uſe. *Heſychius* ſpeaketh of a cuſtom of *burning them*, which cuſtom I ſuppoſe took its original from thoſe Commands of God, whereby he enjoyned the *remainder of the Jewiſh Paſſover*, and of the *Sacrifices of thanksgiving* (and ſome others) *to be burnt with fire*, *Exod.* 12. 10. *Lev.* 7. 15, 16, 17. The Council of *Maſcon* directed them to be *given in the Church, to ſuch Chriſtians as kept their Faſts there, on the fourth and ſixth days of the week*, which were the old ſtationary days. The direction in our *Rubrick* is ordered with as much prudence

Hiſt. Eccleſ. l. 4. c. 35.

Conc. Laod. c. 14.

Heſych. in Lev. 8.

Conc. Matiſc. 2. c. 6.

dence as any of theſe, if it be not to be preferred before them all; for as there is no reaſon to doubt but that they may be eaten; ſo can there be no reaſon produced, why the Communicants may not as well eat them as any other perſons. 3. The eating theſe Elements *in the Church* by the Communicants, out of *a reverent reſpect to the Sacrament*, for which they were conſecrated, is allowable and no way blameable. Both our Articles, and our Rubrick after the Communion Service do acknowledge, that the *ſacramental Bread and Wine even in the Sacrament, do remain in their proper ſubſtances*, which with other expreſſions in our Liturgy, ſufficiently exclude the *Romiſh* corruptions. Yet ſince we believe this Sacrament to be an *excellent Goſpel Ordinance*, I ſuppoſe that out of reſpect thereunto, devout Chriſtians do generally acknowledge, that even the *Veſſels* particularly appointed for the Bread and Wine at the Communion, and the *Communion Table* ſhould not be uſed at mens ordinary meals; and certainly a due reſpect to Gods Ordinance, for which they are ſet apart, will not allow this, which was alſo condemned by the ancient Canons: and it appears very reaſonable, that thoſe *Elements which were conſecrated for the Sa-*

crament, may be uſed with at leaſt as much reverence as the *Communion Cup or Patine*. And when *Ameſius* truly aſſerteth that it *neceſſarily followeth from the Religious honour of God, that thoſe things which have any reſpect unto Gods Worſhip, ought to receive from us a privative honour, even when they are not uſed to a holy uſe*, as he inſtanceth in *Bread and Wine left at the Communion*, which is to be honoured privatively, that is, care ought to be taken that it be *not uſed contemptibly, and ſacred Phraſes* (as ſacramental words, &c.) *not to be uſed in ſport*: even hence it will follow, that they may be uſed with a *relative honour*; that is, ſo uſed as to expreſs a reverence to thoſe holy Ordinances, to which they bear relation.

De Conſc. l. 4. c. 31. Sect. 3.

SECT. III.

Of the ſaving Regeneration of Infants in Baptiſm, and the grounds upon which it may be aſſerted.

1. THE next Office in the Book of Common Prayer is that of *Baptiſm*, where that which requireth principal conſideration, is that every baptized Infant is declared *Regenerate*, and thanks is returned to God (after Baptiſm) *that he*

he hath regenerated this Infant by his holy Spirit, and the beginning of the Catechiſm declareth, that the Child in *Baptiſm was made a Member of Chriſt, a Child of God, and an Inheritor of the Kingdom of Heaven.* Theſe expreſſions have been ſomewhat differently underſtood, ſome applying them to a *ſaving Regeneration* of every baptized Infant, others to a *federal Regeneration*, or a *Regeneration Sacramento tenus.* And I ſuppoſe it evident, that if it can be certainly proved, that every baptized Infant is *ſavingly* regenerated, or if on the other ſide all the expreſſions in the Liturgy can be fairly and probably interpreted of a *federal* Regeneration, which is generally acknowledged, there can be then no doubt but all theſe expreſſions may be fitly and allowably uſed. I ſhall treat of both theſe ſenſes, becauſe they both plead *an allowance in our Church*; and indeed the latter doth not neceſſarily deſtroy, but may well conſiſt with the former.

2. Beginning with the former, I ſhall firſt ſhew what evidence there is, that the acknowledging *a ſaving regeneration of every Infant baptized*, hath been the Doctrine publickly received in this Church, ever ſince the Reformation. This is the more probable ſenſe of that *Rubrick*

before the Catechiſm, in the former Book of Common-Prayer, and *that at the end of Baptiſm* in the preſent Book, both which declare, that *Children baptized are undoubtedly ſaved*; that is (as the firſt Book of *Edw.* VI. and our preſent Book do expreſs it) *if they die in their infancy, and before they commit actual ſin.* And our Book of Homilies declareth, that *Infants being baptized, and dying in their infancy, are by his* (Chriſts) *Sacrifice waſhed from their ſins, brought to Gods favour, and made his children and inheritors of his Kingdom of Heaven.* To theſe I ſhall add what Biſhop *Cranmer*, who was a great Inſtrument in our Reformation, and Biſhop *Juell* a principal Defender thereof write concerning Baptiſm, complying with the ſenſe here expreſſed. Biſhop *Cranmer* ſaith, *For this cauſe Chriſt ordained Baptiſm in water, that as ſurely as we ſee, feel, and touch water with our bodies, ſo aſſuredly ought we to believe when we be baptized, that Chriſt is verily preſent with us, and by him we be new born again ſpiritually, and waſhed from our ſins, and graffed in the ſtock of Chriſts own body, ſo that as the Devil hath no power againſt Chriſt, ſo hath he none againſt us, ſo long as we remain graffed in that ſtock*, &c. Biſhop *Juell* declareth the Doctrine

Hom. of Salvation of Mankind by Chriſt, Part. 1.

Of the Lords Supper, lib. 1. *c.* 12.

Def. of Apol. Part. 2. *c.* 11. *Sect.* 3.

Doctrine of the Church of *England* thus, *We confeſs and have evermore taught, that in the Sacrament of Baptiſm, by the death and blood of Chriſt, is given remiſſion of all manner of ſin, and that not in half or in part, or by way of imagination or by fancy; but whole, full, and perfect of all together, ſo that now as S.* Paul *ſaith, There is no condemnation to them that be in Chriſt Jeſus.*

3. But it muſt be here noted, that by the *ſaving regeneration* of baptized Infants, it is not intended that their underſtandings or wills are guided to an high eſteem and love of God and the Chriſtian life, which the Infant ſtate is not capable of: but this regeneration is mainly *relative*, ſo that being regenerated by Baptiſm, they are no longer the Children of wrath, and under the curſe due to original ſin; but are brought into a new ſtate, to be *members of the body of Chriſt*, and thereby partakers of the favour of God. And though ſome ſmall ſeeds of *gracious diſpoſition* may be in Infants, who are capable thereof in the ſame manner as they are of corruption; yet that *regeneration or renovation* of an Infant in Baptiſm, whereby he is received into a ſtate of remiſſion and Salvation, is very different from the regeneration of an adult perſon, whereby

his ſoul and life is moulded according to the *form of the Chriſtian Doctrine*, and brought into a conformity to the Image of God; and ſo S. *Auguſtine* diſtinguiſheth them; *Renovatio* (ſaith he) *quæ fit ad imaginem Dei non momento uno fit, ſicut momento uno fit illa in baptiſmo renovatio, remiſſione omnium peccatorum.* And even this benefit of Infant Baptiſm, is vouchſafed *by the Holy Ghoſt*, for *by one Spirit we are all baptized into one body*, 1 *Cor.* 12. 13. And it muſt needs be the work of God and of his *Grace*, to accept an Infant born under Original ſin into his favour, or as S. *Auguſtine* expreſſeth it: *By the grace of God, the guilt of all ſins that are paſt, is pardoned in them who are baptized into Chriſt, which is done by the Spirit of Regeneration*; and *in the Adult their will is cured by the Spirit of Faith and Charity.*

Aug. de Trin. l. 14. c. 17.

Aug. Retract. l. 1. c. 13.

4. Now that all baptized Infants are ſavingly regenerated, is aſſerted upon ſuch Arguments as theſe. 1. Becauſe Baptiſm doth evidence every perſon rightly baptized according to Gods will to be *received by the will of God*, to be *under the terms of the Covenant of Grace*; but he who is rightly received to be under the Covenant of Grace is in the favour of God, if the conditions of that Covenant

Covenant on his part be performed, nor doth any thing exclude him from that favour beſides the ſinning againſt or the breach of thoſe conditions. But *Original ſin* (of which alone Infants are guilty) was ſuppoſed to be the ſtate under which man lay, when the Covenant of Grace was tendered to him, and ſo is no *breach of the conditions of that Covenant*, but may be pardoned by the benefits thereof. And no condition can be aſſigned to be performed on mans part, by or concerning an *Infant born in the Church*, more than is included in its being baptized (which I ſhall further clear when I ſhall treat of the condition of believing which is generally propounded) even as the being *circumciſed* was of old the *performing the condition* of Gods Covenant, by the ſeed of *Abraham*, *Gen.* 17. 7, 10, 11, 12, 14. faith and obedience being alſo neceſſary in perſons adult. But that Baptiſm doth admit the perſon baptized a right to be under the terms of the Covenant of Grace is manifeſt, becauſe *they are baptized into Chriſts body*, 1 Cor. 12. 13. *They are baptized into Chriſt and have put on Chriſt*, Gal. 3. 27. *And are baptized into the death of Chriſt*, *Rom.* 6. 3. and even Circumciſion it ſelf was a *ſeal of the Righteouſneſs of Faith*, Rom. 4. 11.

2. The

5. 2. The Goſpel Doctrine, and the holy Sacraments do *convey ſaving benefits* to them who receive them *aright*, and are partakers of them with *due qualifications*. That Infants born in the Church are fitly qualified to receive Baptiſm, is not only manifeſt from the *general practice* of the Church from the Apoſtles times in baptizing Infants; but alſo from the *favour of God expreſſed* towards them in the Covenant of Grace, and in that *Circumciſion* was *adminiſtred* to Infants, which was a Seal of the Covenant of Grace. And as the Goſpel Doctrine bringeth Salvation to him who rightly receiveth it, and the Lords Supper tendereth Chriſt and remiſſion of ſins to the worthy partakers thereof; ſo even Baptiſm conveyeth ſaving benefits to them who receive it with due qualifications: hence S. *Paul* calleth it the *waſhing of regeneration, by which God ſaved us*, Tit. 3. 5. S. *Peter* commanded them who were pricked in their hearts *to repent, and be baptized in the Name of the Lord Jeſus, for the remiſſion of ſins*, *Act.* 2. 37, 38. and *Ananias* directed *Paul* to be *baptized, and waſh away his ſins*, *Act.* 22. 16. Which places both ſhew, that Baptiſm doth convey remiſſion of ſins, to them who are qualified aright to receive it, and alſo that they who were

were under a due preparation to receive remiſſion of ſins by Baptiſm, were *not partakers* thereof without Baptiſm. And indeed no adult perſon is ordinarily capable of remiſſion, but by joining inward *faith* and *repentance* with *outward Baptiſm*, as is expreſſed, *Mar.* 16. 16. *Act.* 2. 38. Baptiſm being the inſtituted Ordinance wherein they muſt declare repentance in coming to Chriſt, and profeſs faith in accepting the Goſpel and receive gracious Union with Chriſt. Wherefore ſince Baptiſm doth bring the *due receiver* thereof into a *ſaving eſtate*; infants muſt alſo be acknowledged due receivers of Baptiſm, and rightly admitted thereto.

6. 3. Chriſt hath appointed his word and Sacraments, as the ordinary means of Salvation to the Members of his Church, *Eph.* 5. 26. *That he might ſanctifie and cleanſe it with the waſhing of water by the word.* But infants dying in infancy are capable of no other Ordinance of Chriſt but Baptiſm, and therefore that is to them *the only means of Salvation.* And it ſeemeth *injurious to the grace of God*, to imagine that he appointeth any *only means*, which is ineffectual to the end, though it be complyed with, as much as is poſſible it ſhould be, by them who make uſe thereof: but the infant ſtate

can

can admit no more, but that they ſhould be *paſſive recipients*, both of this Ordinance and of Divine Grace, and therefore thereby they obtain Salvation. Now that Baptiſm is deſigned to be a means of Salvation, beſides the Scriptures abovementioned, is expreſſed by S. *Peter*, 1 *Pet.* 3. 21. who ſaith *that Baptiſm now ſaveth us.* And whereas that Apoſtle preſently added, that it is *not the putting away the filth of the fleſh, but the anſwer of a good Conſcience towards God*; he doth not thereby look off from the Sacrament of Baptiſm, to ſomething elſe as a means of Salvation; but he thereby declareth, that this Chriſtian Sacrament is not as the *Jewiſh Purifications*, only a putting away the filth of the fleſh, but it is a *profeſſed engaging* of man to God, or to the Covenant of Grace.

7. 4. If baptized Infants born in the Church be not in their Baptiſm in a ſtate of Salvation, it will be hard to ſhew what *benefit*, any Infant dying in his Infancy, can enjoy thereby. Now to aſſert that they have *no Benefit by Baptiſm*, would be to render that Ordinance to them *uſeleſs and of no effect*, which the Scriptures do declare to be of a *ſaving nature*; and to exclude a being *buried with Chriſt*, *Col.* 2. 12. Now if it be ſaid that by Baptiſm they

they *become members* of *Chriſt*, what advantage can this be to them, if this Memberſhip doth not include the favour of God, and a ſtate of Salvation? If it be ſaid that it may be *hoped* that God will *ſave the baptized infant*; this indeed may be hoped with confidence, if Baptiſm bring them into a ſtate of ſalvation; but if Baptiſm (ſuppoſing always the Grace of God tendred therein) do not enſtate them in ſalvation, then muſt they be ſaved only by Gods *extraordinary grace*, not by the *ordinary grace of his promiſe*, to them who embrace aright the means of ſalvation, or by the *grace* of God in the Ordinance of *Baptiſm*, and therefore this Salvation would not be an advantage flowing from their Baptiſm. But if it be ſaid that by Baptiſm the *Covenant of grace is ſealed* to ſuch Infants, we muſt here further conſider, that Gods Covenant by reaſon of his faithfulneſs, goodneſs and Soveraignty cannot be *ſealed* as mens Covenants are, to *make it firm and binding*, when it would otherwiſe be void and of no force. Wherefore there remain two ways, whereby the Sacraments as they are on Gods part Seals of the Covenant of Grace, may be of great advantage unto us: the one is, as they give *further aſſurance*, of the priviledges of that Covenant

venant for our comfort; but of this benefit theſe infants are not capable, partly becauſe the receiving this comfort, requireth the exerciſe of *judgment and conſideration*; and partly becauſe the evident ſureneſs of Gods Covenant, can be no cauſe of *conſolation* to them, unleſs we admit that there is ſome *ordinary means appointed* of God, whereby they may attain the bleſſings ſo aſſured: the other way of advantage is, by the benefits of Gods Covenant being *ſealed, or ſurely conveyed*, as the preſent intereſt and priviledge of the perſons, *rightly receiving* theſe Seals, and in this way which encludeth ſaving regeneration, infants are indeed capable of receiving *wonderful beneſit* thereby.

8. 5. And (omitting other arguments) even the *Prayers* of the Church, with faith and confidence, upon the other grounds above-mentioned, *not doubting but earneſtly believing, that God will favourably receive thoſe infants, and embrace them with the arms of his mercy*, do give further aſſurance of forgiveneſs of ſin, and a ſtate of ſalvation, for baptized Infants: For God who hath declared his favour towards them, and encluded them in his Covenant, doth direct, 1 *Joh.* 5. 16. that *if any man ſee his*

his Brother ſin a ſin which is not unto death, he ſhall ask and ſhall give life for them that ſin not unto death, and this general command encludeth Gods gracious anſwer to ſuch Prayers: and Prayer which is a general means to obtain Grace, is uſed for the *obtaining ſaving benefits in Baptiſm*, with the greater encouragement, becauſe the bleſſings prayed for, are tendred in this Ordinance, and by Gods promiſe, unto Infants who receive Baptiſm. To this purpoſe S. *Auguſtine* ſaith, *that remiſſion of ſins in Baptiſm is obtained per orationem*, i. e. *per columbæ gemitum, by the Prayers and groans of them who live in Peace, Love and Unity*: and our Church in the Prayer before the words of the Goſpel, in the Baptiſmal Office, urgeth Gods promiſe, *Ask and you ſhall receive, ſeek and you ſhall find, &c.* the uſefulneſs and benefit of Prayer being here the ſame in *Baptiſm*, as it is in the moſt religiouſly prepared perſon for receiving the *benefits of the Communion.*

De Bapt. cont. Don. l. 3. c. 18.

SECT.

SECT. IV.

The Doctrine of the ancient, and divers Reformed Churches, herein obſerved.

Conc. Milev. c. 2. 1. In obſerving the Doctrin of the ancient Church, I ſhall begin with Councils. The Council of *Milevis condemned thoſe, who denyed infants to be baptized for the remiſſion of ſin, or who aſſerted that they did not draw that original ſin from* Adam, *which is purged by the laver of regeneration*; and they declare, that *by the rule of the Catholick Church, Infants are baptized for the remiſſion of ſin, that they may be cleanſed by regeneration, which was derived by generation.* And this Canon of *Milevis* is the more conſiderable, becauſe it was taken into the *African* Code, and with that Code was confirmed by the ſixth General Council. The ſixth general Council in another Canon, requireth, *that thoſe infants ſhould be baptized without any ſcruple, concerning whom there can be no ſufficient teſtimony given, that they were baptized before*; and this it enjoineth leſt ſuch ſcruple ſhould deprive them, τῆς τοιαύτης τοῦ ἁγιάσματος καθάρσεως *of this Baptiſmal purging for ſanctification.* And whereas the Creed of the ſecond general Council

Conc. Carth. c. 124.

Conc. Trul. c. 2.

Conc. Trul. c. 84.

Conc. Conſtant.

Council expreſſeth a belief *of one Baptiſm for the remiſſion of ſins*, the Council of *Milevis* above-mentioned avoucheth, thoſe expreſſions to have been always ſo underſtood in the Church, as to acknowledge *that baptized Infants did thereby obtain actual pardon and remiſſion.* And that *African* Synod whoſe Epiſtle is extant amongſt S. *Auſtins* Works, declared, that *whoſoever ſhall deny that little Children are delivered from perdition, and do obtain Eternal Salvation by the Baptiſm of Chriſt, let him be an Anathema.*

Conc. Mil. ubi ſupra.

Aug. Ep. 90.

2. If we conſult the ancient Fathers, it is beyond all contradiction evident, that real remiſſion and regeneration of all baptized Infants, is acknowledged by S. *Aug.* (*Ep.* 23. *& de peccat. Merit. & Remiſ. l.* 2. *c.* 28. *& paſſim*) by *Optatus, Advers. Parm. l.* 5. *Fulgentius, de fide ad Petr. c.* 30. by *Proſper*, and generally by the ſucceeding Writers of the Church. But ſome have pretended, that *this poſition ſprung from their eager oppoſition of the Pelagians, who denied Children to be guilty of original ſin*; for the removing of which pretence, it will be requiſite to give ſome teſtimony of their judgment of the Eccleſiaſtical Writers, who lived before the appearing of the *Pelagian* tares: S. *Cyprian* nigh two hundred years before

Gatak. de Bapt. Infant. vi & effic. p. 268.

Pelagius, did not only expreſs the *mighty* ſenſible *efficacy of his own Baptiſm* for conferring Grace to him, in his Epiſtle to *Donatus*, but in his Epiſtle to *Fidus* he declareth, *that Infants by their Baptiſm do obtain the grace and favour of God, and the remiſſion of their ſins*; and ſeveral expreſſions of that Epiſtle do intimate that this is the end for which they are baptized: and comparing the ſtate of an Infant coming to Baptiſm, with an adult perſon embracing Chriſtianity and the true Faith, he doth in this reſpect prefer the ſtate of the Infant, becauſe *ad remiſſam peccatorum hoc ipſo facilius accedit, &c. he doth upon this account the more readily obtain the remiſſion of ſins, becauſe the ſins forgiven to him were not his own acts but anothers* (or Original ſin.) *Origen* in his Homilies upon S. *Luke* which were undoubtedly his and tranſlated by S. *Hierome*, ſaith that *Children are baptized for the remiſſion of ſins*, but (ſaith he) *of what ſins?* and *when did they ſin?* and a little after anſwereth, that *by the Sacrament of Baptiſm, nativitatis ſordes, the ſins and defilements with which they were born are laid aſide: and for this cauſe* (ſaith he) *little ones are baptized, for unleſs a man be born again of Water and of the Spirit, he cannot ſee the Kingdom of God.* The ſame Doctrine is alſo

Cyp. Ep. 59.

Orig. in Luc. Hom. 14.

also asserted by *Nazianzen* in his 40*th.* Oration, as the comparing some things not far from the beginning, with others towards the middle thereof will manifest; and this he calleth ἀναδήτως ἁγιαδῆναι *to be sanctified without any sense or apprehension thereof.* Wherefore S. *Aug.* did truly assert, that *of old the whole Church did firmly hold, parvulos fideles originalis peccati remissionem per Christi baptismum consecutos esse, that little Children of the Church of Christ, do obtain remission of original sin, by the Baptism of Christ.* *Naz. Orat. 40.* *De peccat. Mer. & Remis. l. 3. c. 5.*

3. Among the publick Writings of the Protestants, the first *Augustan* Confession asserteth, that *Children being offered to God in Baptism, are received into the favour of God,* and condemneth the Anabaptists who say, *that Children may be saved* (i. e. ordinarily) *without Baptism*; to which the larger Confession, 1540. addeth, *that concerning Children baptized in the Church of God, Christ said,* Mat. 18. *It is not the will of your Father which is in heaven, that one of these little ones should perish.* The Saxon Confession fully expresseth the *saving regeneration* of baptized Infants, and that these words, *I baptize thee, &c.* are as much as to say, *By this mersion, I testifie thee to be washed from thy sins, and to be now received by* *Conf. Aug. 1530. Art. 9.* *Conf. Saxon. de Baptism.*

the true God, who is the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who hath redeemed thee by his Son Jesus Christ, and sanctifieth thee by the Holy Ghost: and it declareth, that *at that time Infants are truly received of God and sanctified:* and to the same purpose is the Confession of *Frederick* the third, the Prince Palatine. And the general expressions of the efficacious saving vertue of Baptism, in the *Helvetick*, *French*, and *Scotish* Confessions are such, that the state of Infants cannot be excluded therefrom. And the *Geneva* Catechism declareth, that *By baptism we are Clothed with Christ, and receive his Spirit, unless by rejecting the promises, which are there tendered to us, we render them unfruitful to our selves.*

Conf. Helv. c. 20. Conf. Gal. c. 35. Conf. Scot. Sect. 21.

4. To give an account of the particular judgments of Protestant Writers, would be a needless, difficult and endless undertaking. Divers of them manifestly assert the *saving regeneration of all baptized Infants*; others do embrace another notion of *baptismal regeneration*, which I shall afterward mention; and some from the use of different ways of expression, and from what they speak with just earnestness against the errors of the Church of *Rome* are sometimes *misunderstood. Rivet* averreth that there is no true Protestant,

Cath. Orthod. Tr. 3. qu. 3. Sect. 1.

ſtant, who doth not approve that of *Aquinas*, 12æ. *q.* 81. *Art.* 3. That *Original ſin is done away in Baptiſm, as to the guilt thereof*, and he there ſaith, that *it is moſt falſe, that* Calvin *and* Beza *ever ſaid that ſome baptized Infants are damned, dying in their infancy, before they commit any actual ſin unrepented of:* and the ſame thing is with much paſſionate earneſtneſs aſſerted by *Beza* himſelf, writing againſt *Tilemannus Heſhuſhius*. And Dr. *Whitaker* againſt *Campian*, undertaking herein to declare the Proteſtant Doctrine, ſaith, *In baptiſm we receive remiſſion of ſins, we are entred into Chriſts Family, we have the Holy Ghoſt given us, we are raiſed to certain hope of eternal life: what hath your Baptiſm* (ſaith he to *Campian*) *that ours hath not? hath it grace? hath it the merits of Chriſt? hath it ſalvation? all theſe hath ours.* And againſt *Duræus* in defence of his anſwer to *Campian* he ſaith, *To the adult Faith is neceſſary, that Baptiſm may be a ſaving Sacrament; but to little ones becauſe they are the Children of believing Parents, and are encluded in the Covenant, it is the Sacrament of Salvation, though they by reaſon of their age cannot believe:* where, by the Children of *believing* Parents, his foregoing words declare him to mean, Children born within

Ibid. Sect. 6.

Abſters Cal. Heſh. Calum. 7.

Whit. ad Rat. 8. *Camp.*

Cont. Duræum. l. 8.

the Church, in distinction from *Turks*, *Jews* and *Ethnicks*. These words do express an *actual regeneration of baptized Infants*, by the grace of God, and the application of the merits of Christ, for remission and Salvation; but they are very hardly reconcileable with divers passages, in the posthumous Writings of that learned man, especially his *Prælections de Sacram. Qu.* 4. *c.* 2, 3.

SECT. V.

The Objections against the saving regeneration of Infants in Baptism, considered.

1. Against all baptized Infants being *savingly regenerated by their Baptism*, it may be first objected, That the Scriptures declare the general necessity of *Faith in order to Salvation*, and therefore Infants unless they believe cannot be saved by being baptized. In answer to this (it being a matter of obscurity) I shall relate different ways of solution. 1. Many account *Faith* the condition for *adult persons*, but not for Infants; but this is discarded by others both ancient, and modern; partly becaufe by the general practice of the Church at infant-Baptism, (of which S. *Aug.* taketh notice) it was decla-

Aug. de pec. Mer. & rem. l. 3. c. 2. Aug. Ep. 23. Kemnit. Exam. Part. 2. de Baptism.

declared in the Infants name (as it is in our Liturgy) *Credo, or I believe*; and partly becauſe the condition of Faith ſeemeth ſo generally expreſſed in the Goſpel, that they judge that Infants cannot be thence excluded, though the Faith for the infant ſtate cannot be the ſame, with what is required from the adult. 2. Divers others as *Auguſtine*, *Bede*, *Hugo de Victore*, *Amalarius*, and *Walafridus Strabo* think baptized Infants to be ſaved by the *Faith of the Church* into which they are baptized, or by the Faith of them who *offer them* unto Baptiſm; or as many Proteſtants (and alſo the *Catechiſmus Romanus*) expreſs it, *credunt parentum fide, by the faith of their Parents*; as the *Syrophœnician* Womans Daughter *was healed by her Mothers Faith*, and the ſick of the *Ralſie* was Cured by the *Faith of them who brought* him to Chriſt. But this doth not ſatisfie *Kemnitius*, and ſome others, partly becauſe it is every ones own *Faith*, which is the Goſpel condition for his Salvation, though anothers Faith may be inſtrumental for the procuring of divers bleſſings; and partly becauſe this anſwer giveth no good account of the *Eccleſiaſtical uſage* of owning or profeſſing the Creed in the Infants name at the time of his Baptiſm. 3. Others aſ-

Mat. 15. 28. *Mat.* 9. 2.

fert that there is ſome Faith *wrought* in Infants, which *Calvin* and *Rivet* ſay is *not the act but the ſeed of Faith, by the inſpiration of the Holy Spirit*, and *Kemnitius* aſſerteth this *operation of the Holy Ghoſt in Infants, to be that they call Faith, though they know not what kind of operation it is.*

Inſt. lib. 4. c. 16.
Cath. Ortiv. Tr. 3. qu. 1. Sect. 12.

2. 4. To theſe I ſhall add what I conceive moſt probable, That ſince Infants are not capable of *the Faith of adult perſons*, which cometh by hearing, and conſiſteth in the knowledge and aſſent of the mind, with the engagement to love ſubmiſſion and acceptance of the heart; and ſince there are different degrees of Faith, in ſeveral adult Chriſtians, and different acts of Faith, relating to the object thereof, in the Jewiſh and Chriſtian Church; it will be ſufficient that the Faith which referreth to Infants, have only ſome *general agreement* in its notion, with the *Faith of the adult.* Now ſince the Faith of the adult is an *acceptance* of the Covenant of Grace, and the Goſpel Doctrine, with a *ſubmiſſion* thereunto, which in their ſtate requireth an active exerciſe of the whole Soul, Mind and Will; when an Infant is ſaid to *believe*, this muſt conſiſt in ſuch an acceptance of and ſubmiſſion of the Goſpel, as his State

is

is capable of, which is *Paſſively*. Thus by *being baptized he accepteth Chriſt*, and the Covenant of Grace, being united to and made a Member of that Church, which holdeth Chriſt as the head, and the Goſpel Covenant as the ground of Hope (or if Baptiſm cannot be obtained, its *being deſigned* may be here conſiderable) and hereby according to their capacities, Infants do enter upon a profeſſion, and acceptance of the Chriſtian Faith, which their ſureties declare, and themſelves ſtand obliged to own, when they come to years of underſtanding. To this purpoſe in S. *Aug. Infans vocatur fidelis, non rem ipſam mente annuendo, ſed Sacramentum percipendo*; and in *Gratian, Credere eſt infantibus baptizari*, or *they become believers by being baptized into the Faith*, and thus S. *Aug.* giveth an account of the Cuſtome of the Church, declaring Infants at their Baptiſm to *believe*, that is, to *undertake the profeſſion of the Faith*, and this he calleth, *ſaluberrimæ conſuetudinis rationem, an account of a very good Cuſtom.* *Aug.* ℔E. 23.

3. *Obj.* 2. *If Infants be ſavingly regenerated by being baptized, then muſt Infants dying without Baptiſm be excluded from Salvation. Anſ.* 1. Though it be certain that S. *Aug. Fulgentius, Proſper, Iſidorus*

Isidorus Hispalensis, *Alcuinus*, and the whole stream of later Writers before the reformation, do pass a sad sentence upon unbaptized Infants, yet even then some, and those none of the meanest, did strive against the stream, as *Biel*, *Gerson*, *Cajetan*, with some others noted by *Cassander*. And it hath been ordinarily acknowledged in the Christian Church, that where *Baptism* could not be *obtained*, adult persons exercising Christian Graces, might *obtain Salvation* without it, even besides the case of Martyrdom: this was *asserted* by S. *Augustin*, largely defended by S. *Bernard*, and the *Master* of the sentences, with his School, is encluded in S. *Ambrose* his hopes of *Valentinian* the Younger, who died without that Baptism which he designed and desired, and is proved by the instance of the *Thief* upon the Cross. And hence it will follow that though Baptism be an *instrument of Salvation*, yet it is not in all Cases of absolute necessity thereunto. 2. There is cause to hope well of those dying Infants who cannot *obtain Baptism*, because the mercy and goodness of God may account them according to their capacity, *passively* to accept of the Covenant of Grace, by being born in a Church and of Parents, who designed them for Communion with Christ,

Cassand de Bapt. Inf.

Cont Don. l. 4. c. 22.

Bern. Ep. 78. Lib. 4. Dist. 4. Amb. de Obit. Valent.

Chriſt, and then embracing Chriſtianity. Of the happy ſtate of ſuch infants, *Rivet* and Dr. *Ward* doubt not, though this latter expreſſeth his leſs degree of confidence where Baptiſm is wanting, through the *neglect or contempt of the Parents:* yet it muſt of neceſſity be acknowledged, that there is greater *certainty of the Salvation* of infants *baptized*, than of thoſe who dye without Baptiſm, becauſe the Ordinances of Chriſt ought by no means to be looked upon as *uſeleſs for ſalvation*; and the promiſe made to Chriſtians and their Seed, is upon condition of their *acceptance* of the Covenant of Grace, *Act.* 2. 38, 39. as was alſo the promiſe to the Seed of *Abraham*, *Gen.* 17. 7.--- 14.

Rivetus ubi ſupra, n. 8, 9. *Wardi Reſp. ad Gat. n.* 18.

4. *Obj.* 3. If Infants be *ſavingly regenerated by Baptiſm*, it would be an excellent piece of Charity to baptize *Pagan Infants*, and even to *murther baptized Infants*, becauſe many of theſe do afterwards by irreligion or debauchery, expoſe themſelves to eternal damnation: but the former is oppoſite to Chriſtianity and the other to humanity. *Anſ.* There can be no *act of Charity*, but what is every way conformable to Chriſtian duty, and is no way injurious to the intereſts of men, and therefore the actions mentioned in this objection are far from being charitable.

charitable. Becauſe 1. To baptize *Pagan* Infants, continuing with them under their *education*, would be to abuſe Gods Ordinance, by adminiſtring it to ſubjects not duly qualified, according to the will of God; and therefore no ſaving benefit could be expected thereby to ſuch Infants; becauſe as Mr. *Hooker* expreſſeth it, *Sacraments are not phyſical but moral inſtruments of Salvation, which unleſs we perform as the Author of Grace requireth, they are unprofitable.* 2. To take Pagan Infants from them *forcibly* and *unjuſtly*, that they may be baptized, and educated in Chriſtianity, is no right act of Chriſtian Charity: for though thoſe particular perſons might obtain that Salvation by *embracing the Chriſtian life and doctrine*, which they cannot enjoy in the purſuance of *Pagan Idolatry*: yet ſuch actions being againſt the right of their Parents, and thereby contrary to that *juſtice and innocency* which Chriſtianity recommendeth, would greatly tend to the prejudice of the name of Chriſt in the World. 3. Pagan Infants undertaken to be brought up in Chriſtianity and as it were *adopted* into Chriſtian Families, have by reaſon of that intended education, a *right to Chriſtian Baptiſm*, as *Abrahams* Servants bought with money had to Circumciſion, with

Eccleſ. Pol. l. 5. n. 57.

with all others born in his Houſe: and if ſuch an Infant die, ſo ſoon as it hath received Baptiſm, yet *Fulgentius* declareth him *factum eſſe hæredem Dei, & cohæredem Chriſti, that he is made an Heir of God, and joint Heir with Chriſt.* *Fulg. de Ver. Prad. l. 1. c. 12.*

5. As to the other part of this Objection, Though it be certain (whatever we judge of Baptiſmal regeneration) that it had been *better for every wicked man*, never to have lived to commit thoſe hainous ſins, for which the *wrath of God cometh upon the Children of diſobedience:* yet there can be no more horrid and uncharitable action attempted in the World, than the murdering baptized Infants: which would be a *wicked acting* againſt the holy command of God, and extreamly oppoſite to the *meekneſs* and goodneſs of Chriſtianity, and ſuch practices would tend to the ruin and extinguiſhing of the preſent Church of God, and to render Chriſtianity *abhorred* in the World, to the prejudice of many thouſands of Souls: and to the *prejudice of theſe Infants*, both in the loſs of their lives, and in hindring them of the opportunity of exerciſing pious and *holy lives* in the World; whereby God might be glorified, and themſelves qualified through the grace of God, to partake of *higher degrees of glory* in the World

World to come; there being good reaſon to judge, that the Apoſtles, Martyrs, and eminent Servants of God in this life, have a more excellent glory in the other World, where all that enter in, have perfect joy.

6. *Obj.* 4. This poſition placeth a great efficacy in order to Salvation, in an *outward action* of man baptizing, yea rather more than in the *Grace of God and Predeſtination:* Since it muſt be ſuppoſed, that many who were in a ſtate of Salvation by their Baptiſm, do yet finally periſh; and therefore alſo all thoſe who aſſert perſeverance in a ſtate of Grace, muſt diſown this opinion of *Baptiſmal ſaving regeneration.* *Anſ.* 1. That it is certain that ſome outward actions of men, not as they are their actions, but as they enclude the tenders of the grace of God, and are his *inſtitutions*, or as they bear reſpect to the Grace and Promiſe of God, may be greatly available to our Salvation: ſuch were the Apoſtles Preaching, and ſuch is the due Adminiſtration of Sacraments; and he who will diſpute againſt the *efficacious vertue* of theſe things, as means of Grace, muſt oppoſe alſo the ſaving benefits of the Goſpel, and of the inſtitution of Chriſt. And the advantage by this Ordinance of Baptiſm is,

Tertul. de Bapt. c. 2.

is, that it is a performance on *mans part*, of what the Covenant of Grace requireth concerning *Infants*, and that it is on *Gods part* an ordinance of Grace; and therefore the benefits by Baptiſm, do flow from the *Grace* and Promiſe of God, and ought not to be conſidered in oppoſition thereto; and even the advantage of baptized Infants dying in their Infancy, is the fruit of the grace of God and Predeſtination.

2. The Queſtion about Perſeverance is well obſerved by Dr. *Ward* to be diſtinct from this preſent ſubject: for to perſevere in the *Infant-regeneration* which is chiefly relative, is no ſufficient qualification for the acceptance of the adult, in whom another kind of *regeneration*, (by inward real converſion, and gracious qualifications and exerciſes) is neceſſary, and of whom the Queſtion of Perſeverance is in the ſame place declared to be underſtood, and to the ſame purpoſe writeth *Amyraldus* alſo. And whereas Infant Baptiſm receiveth the perſon to be under the Covenant of Grace, it is juſtly aſſerted by Dr. *Ward*, that even thoſe who after Baptiſm live in wickedneſs, do continue acquitted and diſcharged from the *Original guilt* of the firſt Covenant, and that bringing deſtruction upon themſelves under the Goſpel, they do periſh altogether

Wardi Theſ. n. 36.

Theſ. Salm. de Perſever. th. 39. Ibidem.

altogether for the breach of the ſecond Covenant, or for not performing the conditions of Chriſtianity, which they undertook in Baptiſm, which alſo was aſ-
Theſ. n. 35. ſerted by S. *Auguſtine*, *Fulgentius*, *Proſper* and the *African Synods* which are by him there produced.

SECT. VI.

Of the notion of viſible regeneration *in Baptiſm.*

1. There is another Notion of *Baptiſmal Regeneration* to be conſidered, That Baptiſm doth certainly *admit* perſons into Communion with the Church of Chriſt, and to viſible Memberſhip with him; and that every baptized perſon whether he be adult or Infant, hath thereupon ſuch titles belonging to him, that he is to be called *regenerate*, *a Child of God*, *a Member of Chriſt*, upon the account of his being then admitted into the Chriſtian Society, and being received by Baptiſm to the profeſſion of Chriſtianity, and under the Covenant of Grace, whereby he is *viſibly* ſuch. And this opinion as it referreth to the *adult*, doth alſo acknowledge, that Baptiſm is to them a *means of Grace*, and of Spiritual Regeneration unto Salvation, when

when they come to it *duly prepared* with thoſe gracious qualifications which are neceſſary to the receiving the ſaving benefits of Gods Covenant, and alſo as it is *well improved* by their future holy exerciſes of life. Indeed there are ſome men who allow no *ſpiritual efficacy* to the Ordinance of Baptiſm, as an inſtrument of grace; but this is an opinion ſo contrary to the nature of a Sacrament, and to the general Doctrine of the Ancients, and the Proteſtant Churches, that it deſerveth to be earneſtly *exploded*.

2. This notion as it is extended to *Infants*, as underſtanding them in this ſenſe to be *regenerated* in Baptiſm, was embraced by ſome in our Church from King *Edwards* Reign, and ſeemeth probably favoured by ſome expreſſions of Biſhop *Whitgift*, and is more particularly expreſſed by Biſhop *Carlton* and divers others. Nor doth the entertaining this way of explication, neceſſarily deny the ſaving Regeneration of all baptized Infants. For though ſome few perſons have *inconſiderately* uttered hard expreſſions againſt many dying baptized Infants, as that *multi infantes damnantur cum baptiſmo*; ſuch words do appear at leaſt ſo *unadviſed and ungrounded*, that I preſume it will be ordinarily acknowledged by

Anſw. to the Appeal c. 12.

them who embrace this notion to be neither ſafe nor charitable to imitate them. But moſt others who proceed this way, though they come not ſo far as to embrace it as a *Doctrine*, that all baptized Infants in the Church are in a ſtate of Salvation, yet becauſe they know of nothing wanting towards their Salvation, they conclude that it is at leaſt very *hopeful to God-ward*, and that the Church by the judgment of *Charity*, muſt acknowledge them all in a juſtified eſtate.

Ubi ſupra. 3. Biſhop *Carlton* declareth himſelf to this purpoſe, *That young Children baptized are delivered from original ſin we doubt not, and if they dye before they come to the practice of actual ſins, they ſhall be ſaved:* and that *Children baptized are put into the ſtate of Salvation, I make no doubt of it, but*, ſaith he, *this we muſt believe ex judicio charitatis.* Which Phraſe of believing by the judgment of Charity (which ſome have thought improper) is I conceive the ſame with thoſe words of S. *Paul*, 1 *Cor.* 13. 7. *Charity believeth all things*; that is, where there is nothing that can determine us to the contrary, Chriſtian Charity requireth us to entertain the moſt favourable apprehenſion, and to judge and hope the beſt. And that Rubrick, *That Children baptized dying*

ing before they commit actual ſins are undoubtedly ſaved, may according to this notion, be acknowledged as certainly true of Children indefinitely, without denying it to be true univerſally. And they who entertain theſe apprehenſions do acknowledge, that all baptized Infants or others are regenerated and juſtified *Sacramento tenus*; or they are viſibly ſuch ſo far as concerneth their profeſſion, and the application of the means of grace; and they may be affirmed to be ſuch, according to the uſual language of the Holy Scriptures concerning Sacraments, and the diſpenſation of the grace of God.

4. And this notion as it is very *true*, ſo it is made uſe of and manifeſtly allowed in our Liturgy, in the office *for them who are baptized in riper years*: where every perſon then baptized is ſaid to be *regenerated and graffed into the body of Chriſts Church, to be born again, and made an heir of everlaſting Salvation through our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, and to have now by Baptiſm put on Chriſt, being made a Child of God and of the Light.* Yet it is not hereby intended to be dogmatically declared, that every adult perſon receiving Baptiſm is thereby in a certain ſtate of Salvation, becauſe true Faith and Repen-

tance which ſome ſuch perſons may poſſibly want, is in them neceſſary in order to the ſpiritual efficacy of the Sacraments, and is ſo acknowledged by the Doctrine of our Church. For as our Articles declare, *that thoſe who receive Baptiſm rightly, are thereby as by an inſtrument graffed into the Church, and obtain remiſſion of ſins*; ſo they alſo aſſert concerning Sacraments, that, *in ſuch only who worthily receive the ſame, they have a wholeſom effect and operation.*

Artic. 27.

Artic. 25.

5. Agreeable hereto are the frequent expreſſions of the ancient Church, in which it was ordinarily and truly delivered, that *Baptiſm* without true *Faith and Repentance*, cannot avail to the ſalvation of the adult, nor put them into a preſent juſtified ſtate. And though ſome words in S. *Auguſtine* by way of diſpute and inquiry, do incline to the contrary, yet that that was none of his fixed judgment, was ſufficiently obſerved by the *Maſter* of the *Sentences*. S. *Auguſtine* proveth that Baptiſm is inwardly of no profit to ſome, from the example of *Simon Magus*; and from the ſame inſtance S. *Hierome* concludeth, that he who doth not receive Baptiſm with a compleat Faith, is indeed baptized with water, *ſed nequaquam baptizatus eſt in ſalutem*, but

Sent. l. 4. *Diſt.* 4. *b. Aug. Cont. Liter. Petil. l.* 1. *c.* 23.

Hier. in Ezek. 16.

but *is in no wiſe baptized unto ſalvation*; and *Cyril* of *Hieruſ.* expreſſeth him who cometh *with his body to Baptiſm, and not with his heart, to be nothing profited.* And this muſt needs be acknowledged for truth, becauſe the performance of the conditions of the Covenant of grace by the adult, can in no reſpect be confined to *Baptiſm* only. *Cyril. Hieroſ. Procatach.*

6. Yet theſe Writers did ordinarily acknowledge, both *univerſally* concerning all perſons baptized, and *particularly* concerning any adult perſon, that they had *put on Chriſt*, and were made his *Members*, and were *regenerated by the Holy Ghoſt*, and *born again*, with other ſuch like expreſſions. S. *Auguſtine* ſaith, *Men put on Chriſt either ad Sacramenti perceptionem, ſo far as concerneth the receiving the Sacrament, or uſque ad vitæ ſanctificationem, as far as reacheth to the ſanctification of life:* which is admitted by *P. Lombard*, who inferreth thence that *all perſons who receive Baptiſm put on Chriſt.* *Cyril* telleth every one of thoſe adult perſons, who came to be baptized, Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον σφραγίσει τὰς ψυχὰς ὑμῶν, *the Holy Ghoſt will ſeal your Souls.* According to the expreſſion of *Rabanus*, any baptized perſon *à Chriſto Chriſtianus vocatur, & Dei Patris & Eccleſiæ matris noſcitur* *Cont. Donat. l. 5. c. 24.* *Cyr. Catech. 3.* *De inſtit. Cleric. l. 3. c. 1.*

noſcitur eſſe filius: is called from Chriſt a Chriſtian, and is known to be a Child of God his Father, and of the Church his Mother; and *Clemens Alexandrinus* accounteth all who are admitted into the Church of Chriſt, to be called *Members of Chriſt* whoſe body is the Church; and towards them who indulge themſelves in Carnal practices and pleaſures, he indulgeth himſelf in this fanciful expreſſion, to eſteem them σαρκὰς ἅγιας τῆς ἁγίας σώματος.

Strom. l. 7.

7. But above all, the language which the holy Scripture uſeth, is to be obſerved, which as it oft ſpeaketh of *Children of God*, and ſuch like Phraſes concerning them who are inwardly renewed by a divine life (which it every where requireth as of abſolute neceſſity) ſo upon account of viſible admiſſion to the Church, and profeſſion of the Faith, it oft applyeth the like expreſſions towards every perſon received into the Church. So 1. S. *Paul* declareth *as many of you as are baptized into Chriſt, have put on Chriſt.*

Gal. 3. 27.

2. Concerning baptized perſons being *Members* of Chriſt, and graffed into his body, the Apoſtle ſaith, 1 *Cor.* 12. 13. *We are all baptized into one body*, and v. 27. *Ye are the body of Chriſt and Members in particular*: Which words reſpect every one in the Church of *Corinth*, who

are

are required from this argument, becauſe they are *members* of Chriſts body, to conſult not themſelves, but the benefit of the whole Church, and to conſider the different proportions of ſeveral Members. And when he uſeth this Argument againſt Fornication, 1 *Cor.* 6. 15. *Shall I take the Members of Chriſt, and make them the Members of an Harlot? God forbid*; he doth no doubt thereby diſſwade every perſon who had undertaken Chriſtianity, from that filthy ſin, becauſe by his Baptiſm, his body was dedicated to be a Member of Chriſt. And to this may be added what our Saviour ſpeaketh, *Joh.* 15. 2. of a *branch in him that beareth not fruit.*

8. 3. Concerning the titles of being *regenerated, born again*, and being the *Children of God*; we may obſerve that even thoſe circumciſed Members of the Jewiſh Church, who denyed the holy one and the juſt, and killed the Prince of life, *Act.* 3. 14, 15. and who as yet had not repented nor were converted, *v.* 19. were yet called *the Children of the Covenant, which God made with Abraham.* And of thoſe Jews for whom the Apoſtle had great ſorrow and continual heavineſs, and for whom he could wiſh himſelf accurſed from Chriſt, he ſaith, that *to them pertain-*

V. Sect. 9. n. 5.

Act. 3. 25.

Rom. 9.

eth the adoption. By which expreſſions it is meant, that they were viſibly Children of the Covenant by undertaking it, and that they were under the tenders and external priviledges of adoption, and under the viſible means of the ſpiritual benefits thereof. Under the Chriſtian profeſſion, the Apoſtle expreſſing to his *Galatians* the difference between being under the legal Covenant which *gendreth to bondage*, *Ch.* 4. 24. and the Evangelical Covenant which bringeth forth them that are *free*, or between *Judaiſmus* and *Chriſtianiſmus* as *Tertullian* ſpeaketh, ſaith, *that the Jeruſalem which is above* (that is, the Covenant of Grace, and the Goſpel Doctrine as *Illyricus* rightly gloſſeth) *is the Mother of us all*, v. 26. and *we are the Children of the promiſe*, *v.* 28. Which things are mentioned as titles of priviledge, which their undertaking the Goſpel profeſſion did receive them unto. And when the Apoſtle telleth them, *Gal.* 3. 26. *Ye are all the Children of God by Faith in Chriſt Jeſus*, it is evident from his ſcope, that by *faith* is there underſtood the Goſpel diſpenſation of Faith undertaken by them, in oppoſition to the Law; and that thoſe who by Baptiſm are admitted to the profeſſion of the Chriſtian Faith, are called the Children of God, *Ch.* 3. 26, 27.

Adv. Marc. l. 5. *c.* 4.

Illyr. Gloſs. in Loc.

27. or by way of distinction, υἱοὶ θεοῦ, *Sons of God*, under great external priviledges of Christian freedom, (and also *inwardly Sons* and Heirs of life if they live as becometh the profession of Christianity) whilst they who were under the Law were Νήπιοι, *Children under age, being in bondage under the Elements of the World*, *Gal.* 4. 1, 3. And since all those who by Baptism do enter upon Christianity, are entituled *Sons of God*; which Sonship proceedeth not from their natural Generation, but from their entrance into the Covenant of God, persons baptized may according to the same sense, be hence called *regenerate* and *born again*: and such expressions also are sufficiently allowed and defended, from the Scripture speaking of being *born again of Water and of the Spirit*, *Joh.* 3. 5. and calling Baptism *the washing of regeneration*, *Tit.* 3. 5.

9. 4. Concerning baptized persons being called *Heirs of Everlasting Salvation*, we may observe, that those Members of the Church visible, who shall be cast into outer darkness, are yet called *Children of the Kingdom*, *Mat.* 8. 12. And they may well be called Heirs, to whom the promise referring to the inheritance is confirmed, and who are by Baptism received under the Seal of the Covenant of Grace, which

which alone giveth right of *inheriting*, *Gal.* 4. 30. On this account the Gentile Church, and every Member embracing the Christian Faith, are called *Fellow-Heirs and Members of the same body*, *Eph.* 3. 6. they also being now by the Gospel grace received to be the *Children of the Covenant*. And S. *Peter* exhorted Husbands and Wives embracing Christianity, to mind their duties, as being *Heirs together of the grace of life*, 1 *Pet.* 3. 7. And when S. *Paul* exhorteth the *Thessalonians to walk worthy of him, who hath called them unto his Kingdom and Glory*; it is manifest that he speaketh to them all, and even to them who were most negligent of the Christian life; to whom such titles of dignity do belong, from their Christian profession and being under the Gospel-Grace; though the *inward priviledges* exhibitted under those Titles, are only the portion of those who do perform the Conditions of the Gospel Covenant. And upon the same account that baptized persons may be called the *Sons of God*, they may be also thence concluded *Heirs of Salvation*.

10. 5. On the same manner, may Christians by Baptism be acknowledged to be *regenerated by the Holy Ghost*, because the entrance into the body of Christ by Baptism, is a priviledge obtained

tained by the Grace of God, or by the Holy Spirit. For in Baptiſm the Miniſter acteth *in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt*, and therefore as *Calvin* aſſerteth, Baptiſm is to be received as from the hand of God; *Baptiſmus accipiendus eſt quaſi ex manu Dei:* Wherefore in like manner as Baptiſm which is performed in the name of the *Holy Ghoſt* hath been ſhewed to *regenerate*, perſons may be properly ſaid to be therein *regenerated by the Holy Spirit*; to which agreeth that Phraſe of being *born of Water, and of the Spirit, Joh.* 3. 5. And as all gifts, and diverſities of operations in the Chriſtian Church, are derived from the Holy Spirit, 1 *Cor.* 12. 4, 11. So particularly this gift or priviledge of being *baptized*, and received into Memberſhip with the body of Chriſt, is acknowledged by the Apoſtle to flow from the *holy Spirit*, unto whom all benefits of Divine Grace and favour are aſcribed. For the Apoſtle ſaith, concerning every viſible member of the Church of *Corinth*, as is manifeſt from the deſign of that Chapter, *By one Spirit we are all baptized into one body:* 1 *Cor.* 12. 13. to which place *Zanchy* referring ſaith, *Vi Spiritus Sancti baptizamur, &c. By the power of the Holy Ghoſt, we are baptized of the Father, into one body of Chriſt, and thereby* *De Trib. Eloh. Par. 1. l. 7. c. 5. Sect. 6.*

thereby regenerated as well by the Spirit, as by the Father and the Son. And again, *Hæc regeneratio seu insitio in Christum, fit à patre sed per Spiritum Sanctum.* And this is agreeable to our Book of Articles, expressing, that *in Baptism the promise of forgiveness of sins, and of adoption to be the Sons of God, by the Holy Ghost are visibly signed and sealed.*

Artic. 27.

11. Besides these expressions, the Scriptures speak of persons baptized being *buried with Christ, Col.* 2. 12. and being *dead unto sin,* and *buried with Christ by Baptism unto death,* and being *planted together in the likeness of his death,* Rom. 6. 2, 4, 5. And as *Zanchy* at large observed, *Notanda est Scripturarum consuetudo, &c. The usual way of the Scripture is to be observed, they call as many as give up their names to Christ, and are baptized into his name, persons justified, sanctified, and the Sons of God.* And in another place he saith, *All who are baptized are sealed unto Christ, as being now incorporated into him by the Holy Ghost, that they may not be under their own power, but under his; by whom they are said to be taken into the fellowship of his Covenant, and to be made one body with him and all Saints, and to be partakers of all spiritual and heavenly good.* And in his next Paragraph he saith, *All who are*

Tom. 7. *de Persever. c.* 2. *p.* 118. & 137, 138.

Tom. 8. *de Relig. Christ. Fides. De Baptismo. Sect.* 1.

are baptized tales eſſe & fieri Sacramentaliter & vere dicuntur, are ſacramentally & truly ſaid to be ſuch and to be made ſuch. Sect. 2.

12. But it may be ſaid, that according to this ſenſe, theſe expreſſions of being *regenerated, born again, members of Chriſt, &c.* have but a low ſignification, not ſuitable to the excellency and dignity of thoſe names. *Anſ.* 1. Theſe expreſſions even as they are uſed at the Baptiſm of the adult, do enclude a conſiderable *hope* and *evidence*, of true ſpiritual Communion and Memberſhip with Chriſt, and of inward regeneration and a right to Eternal Life, which are benefits certainly attained in Baptiſm, by perſons duly qualified for the receiving them. 2. They declare the very high *priviledge* of the *Chriſtian calling*, the entrance into which is the way to the Communion with Chriſt, and to the higheſt enjoyment of the priviledges of the Children and Heirs of God, which thoſe perſons do enjoy who do not neglect the Chriſtian life. And the Scriptures uſually mention thoſe who are under the tenders of Salvation, by terms of great *priviledge and dignity*; not to make them *ſecure* in the diſregarding true piety: but partly to *amplify and exalt* the *Goſpel grace* and goodneſs of God whereby ſo great benefits are ſet before us; partly

partly to manifeſt our great *engagements* to exemplary Piety and Obedience, from ſo great encouragements; partly to *teſtifie* that if we periſh by wilful neglect of God and diſobedience to the Goſpel, this will be to fall into dreadful miſery, out of that ſtate which encluded excellent means and great opportunities, of obtaining Eternal Salvation; and partly to manifeſt that wicked practices in ſuch perſons are both in themſelves more *hainous*, and more *abominable* in the ſight of God, becauſe this includeth a *ſpiritual ſacriledge*, or a profanation of what was devoted to God, by the moſt *ſolemn dedication of Chriſtian Baptiſm.*

13. Thus under the Old Teſtament, it was no argument for neglect and ſecurity, but an high expreſſion of Gods favour to the Jews, and of their deep obligations to ſerve and honour him, and cleave unto him, when he declared himſelf; *I am a Father to* Iſrael, *and* Ephraim *is my firſt born*; and *turn ye backsliding Children, for I am married unto you.* And it was the aggravation of their ſin and diſobedience againſt God, that he had *nouriſhed and brought up Children, and they had rebelled againſt him*, and that they *broke his Covenant though he was an Husband to them*; and that *Iſrael* and *Judah* who had

Jer. 31.9. *Jer.* 3. 14. *Iſ.* 1. 2. *Jer.* 31.32.

God

God for their Husband, ſhould *play the Harlot*, and *commit Whoredom* and *Adultery*, in departing from him; and *deal treacherouſly with him, as a Wife treacherouſly departeth from her Husband.* And under the New Teſtament, when Chriſt ſaid of *Capernaum*, that ſhe was *exalted to Heaven, but ſhould be brought down to Hell*; this both expreſſed Gods exceeding kindneſs manifeſted unto them, and their very unanſwerable behaviour, together with the aggravation of their miſery, that after ſuch tenders of Salvation, it ſhould be *more tolerable for* Sodom *than for them.* And the Apoſtolical Doctrine abundantly teſtifieth, that to *defile the Temple of God*, and *prophane the members of Chriſt*, are practices execrably impious, and deſtructively pernicious.

Hoſ. 2. 2, 3, 4, 5, 7. Jer. 3. 20. Mat. 11. 23. 1 Cor. 3. 16, 17. Ch. 6. 15, 19.

SECT. VII.

Of Sureties, and ſome other things in the Office for Baptiſm.

1. The next thing to be conſidered, is the uſe of *ſureties*, or of *Godfathers and Godmothers.* Theſe have been received and appointed by the *Bohemian*, *French*, *Dutch*, and other Proteſtant Churches, and that the Primitive Church had *ſponſors* for Infants at their Baptiſm, is evident from divers paſſages in S. *Auguſtine*, and from the Author *de Hierarchia Eccleſiaſtica*,

Tertul. de Bap. c. 18. *De Synag. Jud. c. 2.* *Synopſ. Pur. Theol. Diſp. 44. n. 54.*

ſiaſtica, and alſo from *Tertullian*, ſpeaking of the *Sponſores circa parvulos in Baptiſmo*. *Buxtorf* telleth us, that the Jews at their Circumciſion have a *ſuſceptor*, or *compater*; and among others, the *Leyden Profeſſors* have eſteemed that place of the Prophet *Eſay*, *Iſ.* 8. 2, 3. to be an inſtance of the ancient uſe of ſuch witneſſes, at the *Circumciſion* of their Children, and that from thence this uſage in the Primitive Chriſtian Church was received. Now though the uſe of ſureties be not much oppoſed, yet 1. Some impoſe a ſenſe upon ſome expreſſions of the Liturgy, as if ſureties were made thereby a *neceſſary condition*, without which Baptiſm might not be adminiſtred to Infants: and 2. it is objected that they do *declare and promiſe* the belief of the Faith (and the practice of Chriſtian life) in the Infants name, and yet they can neither truly ſay that he now doth believe, nor can they upon ſufficient grounds engage that he ever ſhall believe, *&c.*

2. But 1. It is fully evident, that neither the *uſe of ſureties*, nor their *promiſe* is made a neceſſary condition in our Liturgy, of adminiſtring Baptiſm to Infants, becauſe no ſureties are required at the adminiſtration of *private Baptiſm*, where our baptiſmal Office declareth, the Child

to

to be *lawfully and ſufficiently baptized.* And though it be directed as *expedient*, that if the Child which was privately baptized do live, it ſhould be *afterwards brought into the Church* with ſureties; yet at that time before any notice is taken of the ſureties, the Priviledges of Baptiſm are declared to belong to that Infant; that he is *by the Laver of Regeneration in Baptiſm, received into the number of the Children of God, and Heirs of everlaſting life.* Wherefore theſe words in the form for publick Baptiſm of Infants, *This Infant* muſt *alſo faithfully for his part promiſe by you who are his ſureties*; do only evidence that this which is in it ſelf a thing expedient, *muſt* be practiſed according to the Order and Conſtitution of the Church, which is grounded upon profitable and uſeful conſiderations, for the better aſſuring the Chriſtian education of the baptized Infant.

3. The *Baptiſmal Interrogatories* which are next objected, are both of great antiquity, and of allowable and profitable uſe. That Interrogatories were uſed in Baptiſm, from the very time of the Apoſtles, and that S. *Peter's* ἐπερώτημα, 1 *Pet.* 3. 21. doth allude thereto, hath been obſerved by very learned men with much probability. In S. *Cyprians* time the particular *Cyp. Epiſt.* 70. & 76.

ticular Forms of Interrogation in Baptiſm, were ſo honourably eſteemed, that they were inviolably obſerved without alteration, even by thoſe *Hereticks and Schiſmaticks* who then ſeparated from the Church, although their retaining them, encluded what was prejudicial to the deſigns of their Schiſm. *Tertullian* alſo expreſſeth the cuſtom of uſing *Interrogatories*, concerning the Creed and profeſſion of the Chriſtian Faith, and alſo concerning the renouncing the Devil and undertaking the Chriſtian warfare; and in divers places ſufficiently ſignifieth the *ſet forms* of Interrogations and Anſwers. In the *Greek* Church, as the Author of the Conſtitutions hath expreſſed it, the perſon to be baptized being asked, if he did renounce the Devil, and ingage himſelf to the warfare of Chriſt and believe, he anſwered Ἀποτάσσομαι τῷ Σατανᾷ, &c. and Συντάσσομαι τῷ Χριστῷ καὶ πιστεύω, *I renounce the Devil, &c. I ingage under the Banner of Chriſt and believe.* And the fixed uſe of certain Interrogatories and Anſwers is mentioned by *Dionyſius Alexandrinus*, as being obſerved in Baptiſm before his time.

Tertul. de Pudic. c. 9. de Bapt. c. 6. Ad Mart. c. 3. de ſpect. c. 4. de Cor. Mil. c. 3.

Conſt. Apoſt. l. 7. c. 42.

Euſeb. Hiſt. Eccl. l. 7. c. 8.

4. The uſe of Interrogatories, at the Baptiſm of *Infants* to be anſwered by others in their names, was encluded as part of this ancient Eccleſiaſtical practice, as may be

be collected from the place above-mentioned, from *Tertullian* ſpeaking of the *Sponſors of little Children in Baptiſm:* but the ſame is more fully expreſſed by S. *Auguſtine* who declareth his approbation of the uſefulneſs of the anſwers made to theſe Interrogatories in the behalf of Children, and undertaketh to give an account how they muſt be underſtood, and calleth this an *uſeful Cuſtom*; which both intimateth it to be of ordinary practice, and to have been of long continuance. The author of the Eccleſiaſtical Hierarchy, expreſſeth the *Sponſor* for the Child, to declare in his name, ὅτι ὁ παῖς ἀποτάσσεται καὶ συντάσσεται, *that the Child doth renounce and engage*; and *Iſidorus Hiſpalenſis* noteth, that *little ones* who cannot ſpeak or declare they believe, are baptized *alio proteſtante*, with another perſons *making the profeſſion on their behalf*; and this uſage hath been alſo embraced by divers Proteſtant Churches, herein following the *Bohemian* which was the firſt reformed.

Auguſtin Ep. 23.

De Hier. Eccl. c. 7. *ad fin.*

Rat. Diſcip. c. 3. *Sect.* 2.

5. That the true intent and benefit hereof may be underſtood, we muſt conſider, 1. That every perſon baptized, thereby undertaketh to *renounce the Devil, to embrace* the Chriſtian Faith, and to become the *Servant* of God, and Diſciple

of Jeſus Chriſt. This is evident from that command of Chriſt, *Mat.* 28. 19. Μαθητεύσατε βαπτίζοντες make them Diſciples by baptizing them, and from the form of Baptiſm, *in, or into the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghoſt*; and from ſuch expreſſions as theſe, concerning them who have undertaken Baptiſm, That they *are dead unto ſin*, ſo as that they *ſhould not live any longer therein*, that they *are baptized into Chriſt*, and *into the likeneſs of his death*, and that they have *put on Chriſt*. 2. That Infants are capable of being engaged to God, and may ſtand obliged *to believe in God, and ſerve him*, and to reject the ways of ſin and wickedneſs. This is manifeſt from the Circumciſion of Children under the Law, and from their little ones entering into Covenant with God, *Deut.* 29. 11, 12, *&c.* and is encluded in the Baptiſm of Infants, which is *a dedicating them* unto God, and layeth an obligation upon them to entertain and perſevere in the Chriſtian Life and Faith, whether they have any Sureties or no: and he that owneth not this obligation from his Baptiſm, doth go far toward the *renouncing of Chriſtianity*. 3. That when the Sureties anſwer in the Childs name, *I believe, I renounce, &c.* this is a more ſolemn *repreſentation*

or

or declaration, of what the Child undertaketh by his Baptiſm, and hereby as the Maſter of the ſentences determineth, *parvulus hac ſponſione tenebitur non ſponſor*, *the Child and not the ſurety ſtandeth bound by this engagement*: only *the Surety is obliged* to be careful of admoniſhing him. This explicite Declaration of what the baptized Infant undertaketh, is fitly uſed in Baptiſm, *conformably to Antiquity*, becauſe it tendeth to expreſs clearly, a conſiderable part of the deſign and end of Chriſtian Baptiſm, and to put all other baptized perſons in mind of their engagement that they may live anſwerably thereto. And the matter of this *baptiſmal vow* being expreſſed in the publick Congregation, in the Childs name, where all who are preſent may bear witneſs thereto, may be a conſiderable argument to be urged upon him when he cometh to Age, to induce him to the greater *diligence* in the Chriſtian life. And theſe words of the Sureties, *I believe*, *&c.* are not directly words of promiſe of what they undertake ſhall be performed, but words *expreſſing contract and engagement* in the baptiſmal vow, and declaring in what profeſſion and practice, this Infant by his Baptiſm ſtandeth obliged to live and die.

Sent. l. 4. Diſt. 6. g.

6. There is a further advantage by the uſe of *ſureties*, in that they are (as is expreſſed in the exhortation to them) to ſee *that the Child be taught, what a ſolemn vow, promiſe and profeſſion, he made in Baptiſm, that he be vertuouſly brought up.* And that he be inſtructed in thoſe points of Chriſtianity, which *a Chriſtian ought to know and believe to his Souls health*, and to call upon him to *hear Sermons.* All this (which is in our Church required) may well be performed by the Surety, and *impoſeth no heavy burden* upon him, and (beſides the Parents care which may hereby be quickned) it may be of great advantage to the *Religious life* of the Child. The ancient Church either did require more than this from the *Sureties*, touching their particular ordinary care of the Childs Education, or elſe their ſenſe was over-ſeverely expreſſed, by ſeveral particular Writers, as *Tertullian*, the Author *de Eccleſiaſtica Hierarchia*, and ſome others.

Tert. de bapt. c. 18. Dionyſ. ubi ſupra. De conſ. Diſt. 4. Vos ante omnia.

7. Having thus far diſcourſed of the uſe of Sureties, and the intent of the Interrogatories, referring to the baptiſmal engagement; it may be further obſerved, that when they are asked, *Wilt thou be baptized into this Faith?* and they anſwer in the Childs name, *That is my deſire;*

ſire; the plain meaning thereof is, to expreſs, that the intent of the Childs being preſent, is to receive Baptiſm, which upon its account, and in its right and name they deſire for it. And when in the Catechiſm there are theſe Queſtions and Anſwers. Q. *What is required of perſons to be baptized?* A. *Repentance whereby they forſake ſin, and Faith whereby they ſtedfaſtly believe the promiſes of God, made to them in that Sacrament.* Q. *Why then are Infants baptized, when by reaſon of their tender age they cannot perform them?* A. *Becauſe they promiſe them both by their Sureties; which promiſe when they come to age themſelves are bound to perform:* the ſenſe of the former anſwer is, that he who cometh to Chriſtian Baptiſm, is not left at liberty to lead a looſe life, but he ought to *practiſe faith and repentance*, as a previous qualification unto Baptiſm in the adult, and as a conſequent duty upon Baptiſm, both in them who are baptized in their Infancy, and at riper years. And the ſenſe of the latter Queſtion and Anſwer is, That though Infants be not capable of the particular *acts of faith and repentance* in their preſent ſtate, yet by thoſe expreſſions of contract, whereby their Sureties in their name only, declare what their Baptiſm obligeth them unto,

it is manifeſted that they do *undertake faith and repentance*, as much as is poſſible for the infant ſtate, and do ſtand engaged from their Baptiſm, more particularly to act Faith and Repentance when they come to Age.

8. Another expreſſion in the baptiſmal Office hath been miſunderſtood: *viz. Who by the Baptiſm of thy well-beloved Son Jeſus Chriſt, didſt ſanctifie water to the myſtical waſhing away of ſin.* Now we may well ſay that water is ſanctified for Baptiſm, when by divine authority water is ſelected from all other things, and determined to be the proper matter, or outward Element of Baptiſm: and that is *ſanctified* which is ſet apart or determined, to ſuch a ſacred uſe, to which other common things are not admitted. And Chriſts Commiſſion to his Diſciples, to *baptize all Nations, in the name of the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Ghoſt*, is an Authoritative determination of the form of Baptiſm, or the Sacramental words, and of the extent of its uſe. And both from thence and from our Saviours *paſſion* doth it receive an efficacious vertue. But *water* was the *matter of Chriſtian Baptiſm*, for the remiſſion of ſins, and admiſſion into the number of Chriſts Diſciples, before either that Commiſſion,

or

or our Saviours Paſſion. And as water was appointed for the Diſciples of *John*, by Gods commanding him to *baptize with Water*, ſo that this was the Element which was ſet apart, for the admitting Diſciples unto Chriſt himſelf, under the Goſpel, and for the conveying to them remiſſion of ſins, was manifeſted by *Jeſus coming to be baptized therewith*, from whence forward all who came to be his Diſciples, were baptized with water in the *Baptiſm of Chriſt*. To this purpoſe the ancients frequently ſpeak of *Chriſts Baptiſm, ſanctifying the water of Baptiſm.* So *Tertullian, Baptizato Chriſto, i.e. ſanctificante aquas in ſuo baptiſmate.* And the Author *de Cardinalib. Chriſti operibus. Veniebat Chriſtus ad baptiſmum, ut Sacramento perennis daretur authoritas.* To the ſame purpoſe alſo *Nazianzen Orat.* 38. *and* 39. and S. *Bernard de Epiph. Serm.* and even the Annotations under the Aſſemblies name, expreſs this as one end of Chriſts Baptiſm, *to ſanctifie the flood Jordan and all other waters to the myſtical waſhing away of ſin.*

Tertul. adv. Jud. c. 8.

De Bapt. Chriſti.

In Mat. 3. 15.

9. The uſe of the *ſign of the Croſs* in Baptiſm, I here purpoſely omit, becauſe it will be more fitly diſcourſed of in the following Book, where alſo I ſhall diſcourſe of the *Impoſition of hands* in

Ch. 4.

in confirmation, and of the *Ring* in Marriage.

SECT. VIII.

Of the Office for Confirmation, and that for Marriage.

1. The main things referring to *Confirmation*, being considered in the Following Book; and ſome things in the Catechiſm (which are moſt impugned) being ſufficiently cleared from the five foregoing Sections; I ſhall here only obſerve that though our *Catechiſm, Homilies, and Articles*, do ſufficiently declare, that Chriſt ordained only two Sacraments in his Church, yet ſome have taken exceptions at thoſe words of the Catechiſm, which expreſs that there are *two only* (Sacraments) *generally neceſſary to ſalvation*, as if theſe words did intimate the contrary: which exception doth manifeſt how innocent words may be wreſted by the force of ſuſpicions.

Hom. of Com. Pray. and Sacr. Art. 25.

2. And ſome like not that theſe Sacraments are ſaid to be *generally neceſſary to Salvation:* which as it was the doctrine of the ancient Church, ſo is it alſo of the Proteſtant Churches; the *Bohemian* Confeſſion expreſſeth it to be their Doctrine, that

Conf. Boh. c. 11.

that Sacraments are *neceſſary to Salvation*; and the *Geneva* Catechiſm declareth that he who *deſpiſeth the uſe of the Sacraments, is to be accounted of as one who tacitely denyeth the name of Chriſt, and he who thinking not meet to profeſs himſelf a Chriſtian, ought not to be ranked among Chriſtians.* And concerning Baptiſm when our Saviour ſaith, *he that believeth and is baptized ſhall be ſaved*, doth not that beſides other Scriptures expreſs it to be ordinarily part of the condition of Salvation? And touching the Lords Supper, if the *obeying* the great commands and inſtitutions of the Goſpel, and the attending to and receiving thoſe excellent means of *Grace*, and of Communion with Chriſt which he appointeth in the Goſpel, be ordinarily *neceſſary* to Salvation, then muſt the receiving the holy Communion be acknowledged to be ſo. And let it be conſidered without prejudice, whether when our Saviour declared, *Joh. 6. 53. Except you eat the fleſh of the Son of man and drink his blood, ye have no life in you*; theſe words (though they cannot be confined to that Sacrament not then inſtituted) do not ſufficiently declare, that he who hopeth for eternal life by Chriſt, may not ſafely *neglect* the careful attendance on that Ordinance, which Chriſt hath

Catech. Genev. de Sacram.

Mat. 16. 16.

hath particularly appointed, to be the *Communion* of his body and blood.

3. Concerning the *Office for matrimony*, the words of contract will be moſt fitly diſcourſed of in another place, where I treat of the uſe of the Ring. I ſhall here only conſider ſuch Phraſes which ſome diſreliſh, that our Liturgy calleth it an *holy eſtate of Matrimony*, and ſaith that *God conſecrated the ſtate of Matrimony to ſuch an excellent Myſtery, that in it is ſignified and repreſented the ſpiritual marriage and Unity, between Chriſt and his Church.* Now it is manifeſt, that the Apoſtle expreſſing the Marriage inſtitution and Union, *Eph.* 5. 30, 31, 32. calleth it a *great Myſtery*, not as it referreth to the Husband and Wife, but as it myſtically repreſenteth Chriſt and his Church; ſaying, *We are members of his fleſh, of his body and of his bones. For this cauſe ſhall a man leave his Father and Mother, and ſhall be joined unto his Wife, and they two ſhall be one fleſh. This is a great myſtery; but I ſpeak concerning Chriſt and the Church.* And to theſe words of the Apoſtle, the Phraſe of our Liturgy hath manifeſt reference.

4. And when it is ſaid to be *conſecrated*, or to be a *holy eſtate*, this is as much as to ſay, that it is deſigned for a *holy* and religious

religious end and purpoſe. Though the Gentiles lived in laſciviouſneſs and all uncleanneſs; the Chriſtian marriage as well as the whole Chriſtian life is to be a holy eſtate, ſeparate from theſe pollutions: of which the Apoſtle ſpeaketh, *This is the will of God even your ſanctification, that you abſtain from fornication, that every one of you may know how to poſſeſs his Veſſel in ſanctification and honour, not in the luſts of concupiſcence*, 1 *Theſ.* 4. 3, 4, 5. *for God hath not called us to uncleanneſs, but unto holineſs.*

5. Chriſtian marriage is alſo an *holy eſtate*, as it is the lawful way, ſet apart and ordained, according to the will of God, for the increaſe of his Church. Thus Children born within the Church and under the Covenant, are called *Sons and Daughters which are born unto, or for God*, *Ezek.* 16. 20. *holy Children*, 1 *Cor.* 7. 14. and with reference hereunto that the Children may be holy and within the Church, the Apoſtle ſaith, the *unbelieving Husband is ſanctified by the believing Wife, and the unbelieving Wife is ſanctified by the believing Husband:* and upon this account the Chriſtian marriage may well be eſteemed holy and ſanctified, as being a marriage *in the Lord*, 1 *Cor.* 7. 39. and is fitly called, as S. *Ambroſe* expreſſeth it, *Sancta copula, a holy bond.* *Amb. Apol. Dav. c.* 11.

6. And

6. And whereas S. *Paul* declareth how all things are *ſanctified by the word of God and Prayer*; we have concerning marriage a more eſpecial word of Divine Inſtitution, whereby *two are made one fleſh*, *Gen.* 2. 24. and that *no man may put them aſunder*, becauſe it is *God who joineth them together*, *Mat.* 19. 6. and alſo a particular divine *benediction* which God gave unto the eſtate of marriage, *Gen.* 1. 28. And this Marriage Union hath been generally attended with the uſe of Prayers in the Chriſtian Church.

7. Wherefore Chriſtian Marriage, which as well as the Chriſtian life is deſigned for the ſervice of God, and for holy ends and an holy uſe, is upon that account the more fit, to repreſent the *Unity* and *Marriage* between Chriſt and his Church: and this Union being hereby reſembled, is both an argument to the more holy deportment in Chriſtian Marriage, and doth alſo add to the honour of that holy eſtate; and therefore it may well be mentioned as a further *excellency* of that holy relation, that *God hath conſecrated it to ſuch an excellent myſtery, that in it is ſignified and repreſented, the ſpiritual Marriage and Unity, between Chriſt and his Church.*

SECT.

SECT. IX.

Of the Communion of the ſick, and the Office for Burial.

1. The *Communion of the ſick* is very allowable, becauſe the dying ſtate may need the beſt ſupports of Chriſtian Faith, the higheſt encouragements of Divine Grace, and the chief means to ſtrengthen hope, all which is encluded in this Ordinance of the Lords Supper; it being a pledge and aſſurance, yea a tender from Chriſt, of mercy and forgiveneſs, to them who truly repent and believe. And though the celebrating this holy Communion *in private places*, ſtandeth condemned in *ordinary* caſes by the ancient Canons, yet in this extraordinary Caſe ſick or dying perſons were ordinarily allowed to receive it, and the Council of *Nice* doth well approve of the ſick perſons deſire thereof. And though it be ſufficiently proved by *Albaſpinus*, that the *Viaticum* frequently given to dying Penitents, did not always enclude the Euchariſt, yet it is manifeſt that they did frequently partake thereof; as is expreſſed not only in the Canons of the fourth Council of *Carthage*, but in the more ancient

Conc. Laod. c. 58.

Conc. Nic. c. 13.

4. *Conc. Carth. c.* 76, 78.

Euſ. Hiſt. Eccleſ. l. 6. c. 36. ancient teſtimony of *Dionyſius Alexandrinus*.

Rat. Diſc. c. 3. Syn. Petric. Sect. 5. Form. Viſit. Ægr. in Bucer. 2. Divers Proteſtant Churches beſides our own, have retained the uſe thereof; and amongſt them the *Bohemian*, the *Polonian*, with the conſent of the Miniſtry of the three ſeveral Confeſſions, and that of *Strazburgh* as it was in *Bucers* time. And though this was not practiſed at *Geneva*, yet *Calvin* did in ſeveral places, and even towards the end of his life, teſtifie his allowance thereof, and alſo that there were *divers weighty cauſes, which conſtrained him to judge that it ought not to be denied.*

Calv. de quibuſd. Ritib. Aug. 12. 1561. Calv. Oleviano Cal. Dec. 1563.

3. But againſt this it is *objected*, that ſome perſons who have led vicious lives, may earneſtly deſire the Communion in their ſickneſs, and yet not be truly penitent for their ſins, and therefore cannot worthily partake of theſe holy Myſteries. To which I anſwer, that even in this Caſe Chriſtian Charity muſt encline to the more favourable part, and ſince man hath no certain evidences to *judge* of *ſincere* repentance; the infallible diſcerning thereof, muſt be reſerved to the judgment of God. And if this perſon hath lived vainly and exorbitantly, the Miniſter may acquaint him with the *nature* (if need be) of true Faith and Repentance, and

and the *neceſſity* thereof, both to a dying Man and to a Communicant, and if he appear ſo far as is in him deſirous to practiſe and exerciſe thoſe Chriſtian Graces, and to obtain the help of Jeſus Chriſt and his Grace; to deny him this Sacrament, would be to deny him *a teſtimony in Gods name*, that he will upon theſe conditions beſtow grace and remiſſion of ſins, and to ſhut up the means of Grace and remiſſion from a Sinner who ſeeketh after it; and certainly it cannot agree with the Miniſters Office, to *reject* thoſe perſons, who in a dying ſtate declare they would *come to Chriſt*. And in the ſtrict times of Primitive Diſcipline, he was thought worthy to be depoſed from his Miniſtry, who either rejected or did not receive any Sinner upon his return; and a peculiar Charity towards dying perſons was expreſſed in divers ancient Canons.

4. In the Office for *Burial* ſeveral expreſſions are miſliked, as being thought unmeet to be ſpoken of every perſon dying in the Churches Communion. Where a firſt expreſſion to be conſidered is, *That Almighty God of his great mercy, hath taken to himſelf, the Soul* of the perſon departed; When yet we cannot aſſert that every perſon dying in our Communion is eternally ſaved. *Anſ.* Beſides what may

be ſaid of the judgment of Charity, the wiſe man telleth us, that the *Spirits of dying men return to God who gave them*, that is, to be diſpoſed of according to his righteouſneſs; and our Church in this place acknowledgeth the mercy of God, through the grace of Chriſt; who now hath the *Keys of Hell and Death*, that dying perſons do not forthwith go into the power of the Devil, who hath the *power of Death*, *Heb.* 2. 14. but do immediately go into the hands of the great God, and our Saviour *Jeſus Chriſt*, to be diſpoſed of by him, according to the promiſes and conditions of the Goſpel Covenant. This is that which all Chriſtians muſt acknowledge, to flow from the great mercy of God towards man; and that this is the ſenſe intended in this place, I am induced to believe, becauſe in the ancient Offices of Burial, they magnified the Divine Power, whereby the unjuſt and *tyrannous power* of the Devil was overcome, and our Lord receiveth us, ἐπὶ τὰ οἰκεῖα δικαιώτατα κρίματα, *unto his peculiar and moſt righteous judgment.* Yet even this ſenſe doth expreſs a general and firm confidence, of the future happy ſtate of all them who heartily embrace the Chriſtian Faith and life; as being conſequent upon the gracious mediation,

Eccl. 12. 7.

Dionyſ. de Eccleſ. Hier. c. 7.

diation, and Soveraign Dominion of Jeſus our Saviour.

5. And whereas this Office calleth the deceaſed perſon, *Our Brother*, and *Our Dear Brother*, theſe Phraſes may undoubtedly be applyed to every perſon, who profeſſing Chriſtianity dyeth in the Churches Communion; Andthat extenſive ſenſe of thoſe words, is ſufficiently warranted by the uſe thereof in Scripture when it commands us to *love our Brother*, not to *put a ſtumbling block before our Brother*, not to *defraud our Brother*, 1 Theſ. 4. 6. to *forgive our Brother*, Mat. 18. 34. and when it ſpeaketh of the *Brother that walketh diſorderly*, 2 Theſ. 3. 6. and of *admoniſhing him as a Brother*, v. 14. and *of thy Brother treſpaſſing againſt thee* —— and if he hear thee thou haſt *gained thy Brother*, Mat. 18. 15. and if any man that is *called a Brother* be a Fornicator, 1 *Cor.* 5. 11. from which place S. *Chryſoſtom* obſerveth that every *Chriſtian man baptized by the laver of regeneration is there called a Brother*. *Tertullian* in a general ſenſe as they are men, alloweth even the *Heathen to be accounted Brethren*, though they be *Mali fratres*, *evil Brethren*; but in a more ſpecial ſenſe he ſo eſteemeth of all Chriſtians, who acknowledge *one God the Father*, and much to the ſame

Chryſ. in Heb. 11. Hom. 25.

Apol. c. 39. *fratres*

Præp. Evang. l. 1. c. 4. purpoſe writeth *Euſebius*. And *Cyril* telleth all thoſe who gave up their names to
Cyr. Hier. Præf. Chriſtianity, that they become the *Sons and Daughters of one Mother*. So that this
V. Albaſ. Obſ. l. 1. c. 19. manner of expreſſion in this Office, is the ſame which the Scriptures and the ancient Fathers have ordinarily uſed, or it is approved by thoſe Writings which only are of Divine Authority, and by thoſe which are in the Church of greateſt humane Authority.

6. The expreſſion of his being a *dear Brother*, doth only enclude a reſpect ſuitable to a Brotherly relation, and expreſſeth that the Members of the Church of Chriſt, had *real deſires* of the welfare of ſuch perſons as are received into its Communion.

7. That clauſe in committing the body to the ground, *in ſure and certain hope of the reſurrection to eternal life*, doth ſo evidently expreſs the Faith and Hope of the *general reſurrection*, wherein all Chriſtians are concerned; when (as it followeth) *he ſhall change our vile bodies, and make them like to his glorious body*; that it cannot reaſonably be underſtood, with a particular reſtriction to the party deceaſed: but it declareth that while this object of mortality is before our eyes, the Faith of the Reſurrection to Life remaineth fixed upon our hearts. 8. When

8. When we give thanks to God, that he hath *delivered this our Brother out of the miseries of this sinful World*, it must be considered, that the ending all troubles and miseries, is an act of Gods mercy, and ought to be acknowledged, though some men by their own neglect of the Christian life deprive themselves of the benefits thereof: as the goodness of God in his patience ought to be owned, though some aggravate their own misery by the misimprovement thereof. And some regard may be had in this expression, to the Christian *hope of a future estate*, which is the more quickned by every instance of our present frailty. And both this and the former expressions may be used with a particular *confidence* of the eternal bliss of any holy person deceased, and with the exercise of the judgment of *Charity* in its proper object.

9. There is only one expression in the latter Prayer, which encludeth particularly our favourable thoughts of the person departed, when we pray that *we may rest in him, as our hope is this our Brother doth.* In the use of which Phrase, we may well express different degrees of hope, according to the different evidences of Piety in several distinct persons. But even where men were vitious in their

lives, there may be in ordinary cases *some degree of hope*, that they knowing and professing the truth, might at last become truly penitent, though we have no evidence thereof. For some degree of *hope* doth not conclude so much as the *judgment of Charity*, and it may be exercised, wherever we cannot certainly determine the contrary. Yet if there should be any such extraordinary case, where not so much as any degree *of hope* can be *admitted*, it is far more desirable, that this expression should be omitted in that singular case alone, (which would be very rarely found) than that all ordinary expressions, of the *hopefulness* of them who depart this life, in Communion with so excellent a Church as this is, should be expunged and disclaimed. For as this would be an undertaking extreamly groundless and deeply uncharitable, so the very sound thereof may be enough to *affright Pagans* from Christianity, and *Papists* from the Reformation, if our selves did not allow ordinarily any hopes of the happy estate of the Members of our Church.

10. Yet that this may not be *misunderstood and misemproved*, when it is applyed to such persons, who have been wanting in the practice of due strictness of Christi-

an

an life, and too much ſwerved from the holy Rules and Doctrines delivered in the Goſpel and received by our Church; we ought to conſider, that this expreſſion of hope, is no *encouragement* to any others to be guilty of the like neglects. For the bare expreſſion of hope is below any degree of evidence: and only expreſſeth that our judgments and underſtandings cannot conclude it *abſolutely certain*, that he was finally impenitent, though his ſtate may appear extreamly hazardous. And whoſoever liveth wickedly, and dyeth without ſufficient repentance, (of which God can certainly judge where man cannot) it will be no advantage to him in the other World, that *his name was mentioned* in the Church with ſome degree of *hope*; or as the Author of the Conſtitutions expreſſeth it, Ἀσεβῶς τελευτῶντας οὐδὲν ὠφελοῦσι μνῆμαι. And the ſtate of ſuch a perſon is not the leſs miſerable, becauſe frail men are not endued with that infallible judgment, whereby they can conclude it utterly *deſperate*. *Conſt. Apoſt. lib. 8. c. 43.*

11. The Charity of the ancient Chriſtian Church, in expreſſing their hope of them who *dyed in their Communion*, is very manifeſt; and it is a great miſtake which ſome have entertained, that through the ſtrictneſs of their Diſcipline, no per-

ſons had their names honourably *mentioned by the Church*, with hopes of their future happineſs, but ſuch who had lived altogether free from any apparent ſinfulneſs of life, or had given ſevere teſtimonies of a *ſtrict amendment*. Indeed ſome rigorous Canons, neither of general practice, nor of long continuance in the Church, would not allow ſome offenders, (whatſoever repentance they manifeſted) to be *reconciled* to the Church, or *admitted to its Communion* throughout their whole life, no nor at the hour of death: and yet theſe Canons have been conceived only to make them perpetual *Pœnitentes*, ſo that after their death their oblations were received; or they all who were admitted as ſuch Penitents, were then owned among them who had *relation* to the Church, and of whom it had *hope*. But amongſt the ordinary rules of Primitive Diſcipline, theſe were generally admitted. 1. That whoſoever came under any cenſure of the Church, *whatſoever his crime was*, he might upon his ſupplication be admitted to be one of the *Pœnitentes* or to be under the rules of penance; and the not admitting him hereto was accounted an heinous crime, becauſe *non fas eſt Eccleſiam pulſantibus claudi*. 2. That if any of theſe *Pœnitentes*

Albaſp. Obſ. l. 2. c. 4.

1. *Cyp. Ep. 54. Can Apoſt. 52. 4. Conc. Carth. c. 74.*

tes were under dangerous ſickneſs, or approaching death, it was requiſite they ſhould be then admitted to the *peace of the Church*, and its *Communion*. 3. That even they, who being under cenſure, did only in the time of dangerous ſickneſs deſire to be *admitted Penitents*, might thereupon forthwith be both admitted Penitents and receive reconciliation and Communion. This is a conſequent from the two former, and is encluded in the Canon of *Ancyra* now mentioned, and is manifeſt by divers other particular teſtimonies, and it was grounded upon this reaſon, becauſe (as *Leo* expreſſeth it) *we cannot limit the times, nor determine the meaſures of Gods mercy*. 4. That all who were ſo received into the Church, with others who dyed in its Communion and even Penitents who dyed without the opportunity of obtaining *diſciplinary reconciliation* had the *memories of their names recommended* in the Churches Prayers, as perſons of whom it *hoped well*: which is I ſuppoſe intended by μιᾶς διδόσθω τῆς προσφορᾶς in the Council of *Nice*, though it be otherwiſe underſtood by the Greek Canoniſts and in *Albaſpinus* his explication.

2. *Cyp. Ibid. Conc. Nicen. c. 13. Ancyr. can. 6. Araus. can. 3. 4. Carth. c. 77.*

3. *Conc. Araus. c. 2. Leo. Ep 91. 4. Carth. c. 76.*

4. *Dion. de Eccleſ. Hier. c. 7. Cyp. Ep. 10. Con. Nic. c. 13. 4. Carth. c. 79. Conc. Arel. 2. c. 12.*

THE

THE SECOND BOOK CONCERNING CEREMONIES, AND *Eccleſiaſtical Conſtitutions.*

CHAP. I.

The lawful uſe of ſome Ceremonies *in the Chriſtian Church aſſerted.*

SECT. I.

What we are here to underſtand by Ceremonies.

1. AMong all the things appointed in our ſervice, there is nothing againſt which a heavier charge is drawn up,

up, than againſt the *Ceremonies*, as they are ordinarily called; common cuſtom herein making uſe of a word which admitteth great variety, and latitude of ſenſe and ſignification. For 1. The word *Ceremonia* (Ceremony) primarily encludeth the general exerciſe of all publick Religious Worſhip and Piety: for as *Scaliger* noteth, *Ceremonia* was as much as *Sanctimonia*, being derived from *Cerus*, which in the old Latin ſignifieth the ſame with *Sanctus*; and *Servius* hath been obſerved to declare that *omnia Sacra apud Latinos Ceremoniæ dicuntur*: and to this purpoſe the old Conſtitutions of the twelves Tables declareth *Sacerdotum duo genera ſunto: unum quod præſit Ceremoniis & ſacris &c.* intending thereby all ſacred actions of Religious ſervice; and in this large ſenſe is this word ſometimes uſed by ſome later Writers, as *Luther* and *Bucer*. 2. This word ſometimes among the ancient Chriſtian Writers peculiarly expreſſeth the moſt ſolemn viſible Symbols of the Grace of God: in which ſenſe alſo in the *Auguſtan*, *Saxon*, and *Witemberg* Confeſſions, and the Apology of the *Church of England*, the two New Teſtament Sacraments are called Ceremonies; and Biſhop *Saunderſon* reſolveth the ſum or main Contents of the Goſpel, into

Scal. in Feſt.

Leg. 12. Tab. De Sacerdot. officio.

Luth. de piis Cerem. ſervand. Bucer. Cenſur. c. ultim.

into these three things, *the Mysteries of Faith to be believed, the holy Ceremonial and Ecclesiastical Institutions, and the moral Precepts.* And these Bishop *Whitgift* calleth *substantial Ceremonies* which are of the substance of Religion. 3. This word sometimes encludeth all such practices as bear any external respect unto Religion; whence some have called Holy days by the name of Ceremonies: and *Gotofredus* probably supposeth that fasting (at least with some other external observations) is so called in those words of the *Code of Justinian*; *Quadraginta diebus qui auspicio Ceremoniarum Paschale tempus anticipant, &c.* 4. In this present enquiry, by Ceremonies must be understood, some particular external and visible actions and circumstances, which are not instituted by God, but are in themselves things indifferent, and are appointed in the Church for order and decency.

De Obl. Conf. Pral. 4. Sect. 32.

Bishop Whitg. Tr. 2. c. 1.

Cod. Justin. l. 3. Tit. 12. Sect. 6.

2. And there is a vast difference between the things called *Ceremonies* in the *Church of England*, and the chief part of those things, which by an equivocal use of the same word, we commonly call *Ceremonies*, in the *Jewish Constitutions*, under the Mosaical Law. For those Jewish Ceremonies which consisted in their Sacrifices,

crifices, Purifications, or the proper Levitical and Temple worſhip, were ſuch things as uſed aright with reſpect to the *Meſſias*, were the way and means whereby Gods acceptance was obtained, and his grace and favour vouchſafed, and did partake of a Sacramental nature, and were not amiſs by *Durandus* called the *Sacramentalia*, and did alſo prefigure Chriſt to come in the fleſh. And upon this account no ſuch rites as theſe, could ever be appointed or lawfully uſed, but ſuch only as were eſtabliſhed by a divine Inſtitution; nor might they be any longer obſerved, than that inſtitution did either enjoin, or warrant and allow them: and hence both S. *Auguſtine*, and S. *Hierome*, do juſtly and vehemently condemn and cenſure the obligation of theſe things among Chriſtians. And of this nature was the *whole pædagogy* of the Moſaical Conſtitutions jointly conſidered, and every branch thereof ſo far as it encludeth an *owning of Judaiſm*, as the way of Gods acceptance: eſpecially *Circumciſion*, *Sacrifice*, and ſuch like ſervices of the Jewiſh Temple: the obſerving of which under the Goſpel, ſince the clear manifeſtation of Chriſtianity, would be to deny Chriſt to be come in the fleſh; and to cloſe with that, as a way of *obtaining grace*

Rational. div. Offic. Procem. Sect. 7.

Aug. Ep. 19.

grace from God, and finding favour with him which is contrary to his will, and ſtandeth for ever abrogated by the Goſpel. And hence it may appear, that he who would charge the uſe of all *Eccleſiaſtical Rites* appointed for Order, and the promoting reverence in the Service of God, as if it encluded the ſame, with reducing the Ceremonial Law of the Jews, might with a fairer plea of reaſon, accuſe all uſe of Seals or Ornamental Engravings to be a forging and counterfeiting the Kings Broad Seal, and thereby to be deeply criminal.

3. Yet it may be obſerved as a *truth* (though it be not neceſſary for the juſt defence, of any of thoſe things commonly called Ceremonies in our Church) that there were many *particular things* in the Ceremonial Law, which ſingly taken and by themſelves, did only include ſome rational proviſions, and comely and fit Conſtitutions, and had nothing in themſelves, which did neceſſarily *reſtrain* them to the *Judaical ſtate*: and ſuch things where there is no deſign of any Jewiſh ſignification, may lawfully be ſtill made uſe of under the Goſpel, as ſtill retaining what conveniency or decency they would have had, if they had never been included in the Jewiſh Conſtitutions. The appoint-

ment

ment of the *Jewiſh Tabernacle* in the Wilderneſs, is no ſufficient ground to conclude it a ſin, for ſuch Chriſtians who ſojourn in deſerts, and have minds far from Judaizing, to build an Houſe with boards, for the place of their Chriſtian Aſſemblies: nor is the building our Churches with *hewen ſtone* to be cenſured as unlawful, becauſe ſuch were the materials of *Solomons* Temple: nor is it unlawful to *uſe Veſſels of Silver and Gold* at the adminiſtring the Communion, becauſe ſuch were the Veſſels of the Tabernacle and the Temple: and the like may be ſaid of *Tithes*, and ſome other things. To this purpoſe *Bucer* determined in his Epiſtle to *Alaſco*, and *P. Martyr* to Biſhop *Hooper*, and Biſhop *Saunderſon* obſerveth, that *all Ceremonials are not to be alike accounted of, but thoſe which concern order and decency, are with prudence to be ſeparated from thoſe which prefigured Chriſt to come:* and that prudent Caſuiſt well reſolved, that thoſe things *Which concerned order and decency, are not now ſimply unlawful; yet may they be many times inexpedient, as they become dangerous by their ſcandal.*

De Oblig. Conſ. Prael. 4. Sect. 29.

4. And it is acknowledged, and declared, that the things with us called Ceremonies, are in themſelves *indifferent*, and no

no direct parts of worship; because these particular things are only of *Ecclesiastical* or *humane constitution*: for since all instituted worship is directly appointed, for the acceptable service of God (which especially considering the fall of man, must be in a way of Grace, and not of Merit) it must be God and not his Creature who must determine, what Institutions will be pleasing to him. And this is the Doctrine of our *Homilies*: and the Book of *Common Prayer* speaking of Ceremonies, expressly declareth, *that those which remain are for a Godly Discipline & Order, which may be altered and changed; and therefore are not to be esteemed equal with Gods Law.* And our Articles assert, that the *Church hath authority to change or aboliſh Ceremonies, ordained by mans authority, so that all things be done to edifying.* All which words shew that there is no holiness placed in these things, nor are they of themselves made any *part of the worship* of God, in the Church of *England.*

Serm. of good works Par. 2. Serm. of Prayer. Par. 2.

Art. 34.

5. Yet even the observation of things indifferent, may by a *secondary* and consequential respect to other commands of God and duties of men (though not directly from themselves) render our services *more acceptable unto God.* Thus that

geſture of body, which is not particularly determined as a neceſſary duty, may be pleaſing to God; as it includeth a religious reſpect to thoſe duties, of *glorifying God with our bodies*, and *ſerving him acceptably with reverence and godly fear*: and the obſerving other decent rites, may be pleaſing to God as it expreſſeth a *reverence* of God, and his Ordinances and ſervice; an obedient reſpect to that command, *that all things be done decently and in order*; a *ſubjection* to our Superiours in things lawful; and a care of the *Churches Peace*. Upon this account *Urſin* truly ſaid, *Adiaphoræ actiones poſſunt Deo placere, licet aliter quam cultus Dei proprie dictus*; *that indifferent actions may pleaſe God, but in a different manner from that which is properly and directly the worſhip of God.* To ſuch general ends, are thoſe indifferent obſervations in our Church appointed, which are called Ceremonies, and hence it is with good reaſon declared in the Book of Common Prayer, that *they are as well for a decent Order in the Church, as becauſe they pertain to edification.* For as whatſoever exciteth reverent thoughts of God, and his Ordinances, is thereby uſeful for the Churches edifying; ſo the Apoſtle requireth rules of Order to be made *for edification*,

Urſin Explic. Catech. q. 99. Loc. Theol. in 2. Præcep.

ſication, 1 *Cor.* 14 26. and S. *Chryſoſtome* truly obſerved *that good Order, Peace and Love are the moſt uſeful things to promote edification.* Οὐδὲν οὕτως οἰκοδομεῖ ὡς ἐυταξία, ὡς εἰρήνη, ὡς ἀγάπη. *Chryſ. in* 1 *Cor. C.* 14. 40.

6. But though external rites ſhould be never ſo innocent in their own nature, as being neither *Jewiſh*, nor owned as *parts* of Chriſtian Religion, nor as *operative means* in themſelves to convey Grace; yet the introducing a great and unneceſſary number of them, would be diſadvantageous to Religion, by obſcuring and darkning the ſpiritual duties and priviledges thereof; by being needleſly burdenſom to Chriſtians, and by diverting mens minds to attend chiefly unto ſuch external obſervances. Hence S. *Augnſtin* in his time (as is obſerved in our Litugy) *complained of the exceſſive number of ſuch rites*: and the conditions which Proteſtant Writers require concerning Ceremonies are ſuch as theſe, that they be *in their kind things indifferent, in their number few, and in their uſe godly and profitable for edification.* Now in our Church, beſides the uſe of expedient geſtures in the ſervice of God, there is nothing which in common Cuſtom of ſpeech is called a *Ceremony*, which in any proper part of worſhip, is appointed in our Li- *Aug. Ep. ad Januar. c. 19.* *Kemnit. Exam. Conc. Trid. de Tradition. 7m genus. Urſin Expl. Catech. ad qu.* 103.

turgy, to be uſed by any other perſon beſides the Miniſter. And in our ordinary ſervice the Miniſter is only required to uſe the *appointed habit*, which though it be cuſtomarily called a Ceremony; is no otherwiſe ſuch, than the Church, Pulpit, and the Veſſels for the Communion, and the Communion Cloath are to be ſo eſteemed, which are only uſed in the Service of God. And in our particular Offices, we have only the uſe of the *Croſs* in the Office of Baptiſm, of *impoſition of hands* in Confirmation, (and the civil rite of the *Ring* in Marriage,) and therefore if the nature of theſe particular Rites be allowable, (which in due place will be conſidered) there can be no dammage to Religion, nor burden to Chriſtians from the number of them.

SECT. II.

The firſt Argument for the lawfulneſs of Eccleſiaſtical Rites, from the liberty *herein allowed to the* Jewiſh Church.

1. Having hitherto endeavoured to prevent miſtakes and miſapprehenſions, about the ſubject of my preſent diſcourſe; I ſhall now lay down ſuch Arguments as will manifeſt, that ſome decent external obſervations

obſervations in the Church, though they be not particularly inſtituted of God, are allowably ordered and appointed. The firſt Argument is from the *practice of the Jewiſh Church*, which I ſhall conſider in a threefold reſpect.

2. Firſt in their *Temple worſhip*. For though they might not lawfully appoint any Sacramental Rite, (which was the nature of divers of the Temple Rites) and though *Solomons* Temple as well as *Moſes* his Tabernacle, was built *according to the pattern* which God directed, and divers other external things were determined by divine appointment, yet even here were ſome things left to the liberty, and determined by the authority of the *Jewiſh Church*, or the Rulers and Governours thereof. I ſhall not here inſiſt upon *Solomons* offering Burnt-Offerings in the *middle of the Court*, and not only upon the Altar, 1 *Kin.* 8. 64. nor upon *Hezekiahs* proclaiming a *general Paſſover*, on the ſecond Month, 2 *Chr.* 30. 2. becauſe theſe were extraordinary Caſes, which were only allowable by the weightineſs of the preſent occaſions; when Ceremonial Commands of God might be diſpenſed with, in Caſes of greater concernment, upon which account it was alſo lawful for *David and them who were* 1 *Ch.* 28. 11, 19.

with him, to eat the Shew-bread. But it muſt be acknowledged, that ſuch extraordinary Caſes, are no more a ſufficient ground for conſtant and ordinary Conſtitutions, than the conſtant keeping a vein open can be concluded allowable, becauſe it may be expediently at ſome times opened, for the preſerving life or health.

3. The firſt inſtance of this liberty among the Jews, concerneth the *Paſſover*; which was (after the building the Tabernacle and Temple) a proper *Tabernacle or Temple Rite, Deut.* 16. 6. and though *Philo Judæus* doth in ſeveral places expreſs the Paſſover to be ſacrificed by all the people of *Iſrael*, and not to be preſented to the Prieſts as other Sacrifices were: both the *Talmud*, *Maimonides*, and divers Texts of Scripture do ſufficiently evince the contrary, as 2 *Chr.* 30. 3, 16, 17. *Ezr.* 6. 20. and however, it was a principal duty of the *Jewiſh worſhip*. But the Jews (differently from what was commanded, only concerning the firſt Paſſover in *Egypt*) uſually *prepared* the Paſchal Lamb upon the *fourteenth day* of the Month; (which was alſo obſerved by *Chriſt and his Apoſtles*, *Luk.* 22. 7, 8.) they uſed alſo divers other Rites about their *Paſchal Cake*, their ſeveral *Cups of*

Phil. l. 3. de Vita Moſ. Lib. de Decalog. Lib. de Septen. & Feſtis.

Wine

Wine and other obſervations concerning that Feaſt. And eſpecially it may be obſerved, that the *diſcumbing geſture* or leaning on Beds or Couches, was the poſture *ordained* in the later times of the Jewiſh Church, for their eating the Paſsover, as appeareth both from their *rituals*, and the *Jeruſalem Talmud* in *Peſachin*; and *Philo* who lived about the time of our Saviours Paſſion, declareth that this was the *geſture of ordinary uſe at that time, amongſt the Jews at their Religious Feaſts*, which was alſo manifeſtly allowable, becauſe it was practiſed by our *bleſſed Saviour* and his Apoſtles; being expreſſed by the Evangeliſts by ἀναπίπτειν, and ἀνακεῖσθαι, *Mat.* 26. 20. *Mar.* 14. 18. *Luk.* 22. 14. *Joh.* 21. 20. And *Scaliger* ſo earneſtly aſſerteth, that *Chriſtus obſtrinxit ſe ritibus Judæorum*; *Chriſt did oblige himſelf, to follow and conform to the commonly received rites of the Jewiſh Paſsover*; that he accounteth all who ſhall deny it, to be *hoſtes bonarum literarum, Enemies to good learning.* But in the firſt Paſsover in *Egypt* they were commanded to eat *with their Loins girt, their Shoes on their feet, and their Staves in their hands*, which could not conſiſt with their diſcumbing: and that they *ſtood ſtedfaſtly upon their feet* is declared by *Philo*, and that the ſame

Phil. de Vit. Contempl.

De Emend. Temp. l. 6. p. 573.

Phil. de Sacr. Ab & Cain.

Baron. Annal. an. 34. n. 41.

geſture was ordinarily *obſerved until the Captivity*, is not improbably obſerved by others. And though that honourable way of diſcumbing at meat, was of ancient uſe in the *Roman*, *Grecian*, *and Perſian Empires*, eſpecially amongſt the *Aſians*: yet the moſt ancient inſtance of its practice and uſage, is by one of our own Nation thought to be in thoſe words of *Ezek.* 23. 41. by *Caſaubon* in *Am.* 2. 8. which is alſo approved by *Grotius*, unleſs the uſe of the word ἀνάκλισις in the *Septuagint* in *Can.* 1. 12. may poſſibly import, that they eſteemed it to be of as great Antiquity, as from the time of *Solomon*. But all theſe inſtances were of a date very far inferiour to the Paſsover Inſtitution.

Kellets Tricon. l. 1. *c.* 7. *Sect.* 13. *Exerc. in Baron.* 16. n. 12. *Grot. in Mat.* 26. 20.

4. A ſecond inſtance concerneth the *Garments*, uſed in the attendance upon the Tabernacle or Temple Worſhip. The holy Garments of the High Prieſt, and the other Prieſts, and thoſe only were appointed of God. But when the Ark of God was brought to *Zion*, *David*, to expreſs his honour to the Service of God, made uſe of a *peculiar habit* dancing before the Lord, in a *Linen Ephod*, 2 *Sam.* 6. 14. And the *Levites* who carried the Ark, and who were Singers in that Solemnity, were alſo *arrayed in Linen Robes*

or

or *Ephods*, 1 *Chron.* 15. 27. as is most clearly and fully expressed by *Vatablus*, and by the *Syriack* and *Arabick* Versions: and *Grotius* there noteth the ancient and ordinary use of *white Garments in Religious Worship*. And when the Ark was brought into the Temple, the *Levites* who were Singers were all of them *arrayed in white Linen*, 2 *Chron.* 5. 12. And *Josephus* saith that *Solomon* made for the *Levites* σὺν ἐκ βύσσου μυριάδας δύο: *two hundred thousand Garments of white Linen*, Indeed *Cappellus* justly accounteth this number to be *incredible*, and it is very probable that either the number is *depraved*, or else *Josephus hyperbolizeth* therein (as is frequent with the *Talmudists*) for the honour of his Nation. But that the use of *white Linen Garments* for the *Levites*, was more ancient than the times of *David*, may be collected from 1 *Sam.* 2. 18. where *Samuel* being yet a Child, is said to have *ministred before the Lord, being girded with a Linen Ephod*: and yet *Samuel* was only of the *Levitical*, but not of the *Priestly* race, and was not as *yet known to be a Prophet of the Lord*. Wherefore these Scriptures do speak the *allowableness* of these *Levitical* Garments, especially considering that they were used at the removal of the Ark, by *David* him

Ant. Jud. l. 8. c. 2.

Cappel. Templ. Delineatio ex Villalpando.

himſelf and the *Levites*, after the time that *Uzzah* was ſmitten, becauſe they *ſerved not the Lord after the due order*. Yet is there not ſo much as any direction in the Law of *Moſes*, that any ſuch garment ſhould either be made for, or uſed by any other of the *Levites*, beſides the Prieſts.

5. A third inſtance is the *Altar of Witneſs*, built by the two Tribes and half when they went over *Jordan* to their own poſſeſſion; which after a jealous inquiry by *Phinehas* and all the Congregation, was well approved of, when it appeared that it was not a *forſaking the God of Iſrael*, or a diſobeying his commands, and renouncing his Temple Worſhip; but was only a *monumental Memorial* of their profeſſion of the true God, and having a right to do his ſervice at the Temple; and thereupon did include an inciting and ingaging them to the true Religion, *Joſ.* 22. 31, 32, 33.

6. A fourth inſtance is the *Temple it ſelf*, as it was deſigned by *David*, for the greater *ſplendour* of Gods Service, and higher honour of his Name. For though God had commanded a Tabernacle to accompany *Iſrael* in their ſojournings, and had given no *Commandment concerning a Temple* as himſelf expreſſeth, 2 *Sam.* 7. 7.

7. 7. that holy man had designed to build a Temple to the Lord, humbly judging it greatly unreasonable, that he should *dwell in an house of Cedar, while the Ark of God dwelt within Curtains*, 2 *Sam.* 7. 2. And this design of *David* was well *approved* of by *Nathan*, *vers.* 3. and God himself declareth, that *he did well in that it was in his heart*, 1 *King.* 8. 17, 18. and thereupon God promised *David*, that he would *make him an house, and set up his seed after him and establish his Kingdom*, 2 *Sam.* 7. 11, 12. and did command, that the thing which *David* purposed should be *effected*, not by himself who was a *man of wars*, but by his Son *Solomon*, 1 *Chr.* 22. 8, 9, 10. *Chap.* 28. 3, 4, 5, 6. And it must be considered, that the Tabernacle of *Moses* was never enjoined, to be the *perpetual habitation* of Gods presence so long as the Jewish Dispensation should continue: and therefore though *David* did not build the Temple, yet he *pitched another Tent* for the Ark of God at *Jerusalem*, where it abode many years, while the Tabernacle of *Moses* was at *Gibeon*, 2 *Chron.* 1. 3, 4. but neither was that action nor his design to build a Temple, contrary to any command of God; but was only a *determination of somewhat external* relating to the Service of God, 1 *Chr.* 16. 1. *Ch.* 17. 3.

to

to expreſs his higher honour and reverence of God and Religion; which was therefore *approved of God* though it was not particularly commanded by him. And if we may herein credit the *Jewiſh Chronicle*, when the houſe of God was ſet up at *Shiloh*, there was a *foundation* laid *of ſtone* (which God had not enjoined nor forbidden) upon which the Tabernacle made of Boards, Curtains, and Skins was erected.

Seder Olam. Rab. c. 11.

7. I know that the *Jewiſh* Writers do aſſert, *that the Law of* Moſes *did command the building the Temple*; (by which I here underſtand a houſe of ſtone and Cedar as diſtinguiſhed from the Tabernacle) this ſeemeth to be affirmed by *Maimonides*, and is aſſerted by the *Talmud*, and *Joſephus* ſaith, *David* deſigned to *build a Temple*; ὡς Μωσῆς προεῖπεν, *as Moſes had foretold*. But this is not agreeable to what God himſelf declareth to the contrary, 2 *Sam.* 7. 7. *Spake I a word with any of the Judges of Iſrael whom I commanded to feed my people Iſrael, ſaying, Why build ye not me an houſe of Cedar?* and the ground upon which theſe *Jewiſh* Writers build is miſtaken. For 1. that place which the *Gemara* inſiſteth upon, *Deut.* 12. 10, 11. concerning the place *which God ſhould chuſe*, only enjoineth a fixed place for the

Maim. in prac. affirm. 20. *Gemar. in Sanhedr. c.* 2. *Sect.* 6. *Joſeph Ant. Jud. l.* 7. *c.* 4.

the Tabernacle of God and his Service, where he ſhould chuſe it, after he had placed them in *Canaan*, as may appear by comparing *Deut.* 12. 1, 5, 11, 12. *Joſh.* 18. 1. *Jer.* 7. 12. and the Tabernacle is expreſſly called בית הבחירה *the houſe of choice*, in the *Seder Olam*. And thoſe words, *Exod.* 15. 2. *I will prepare him an habitation*, being ſpoken before the building of the Tabernacle, do refer thereto; and the Tabernacle is expreſſly called *his habitation*, 1 *Sam.* 2. 29. 2 *Sam.* 15. 25. and in divers other places: as it was alſo very frequently called by the name of the *Temple*, both in the Pſalms and in the Books of *Samuel*, and the *Sanctuary* in the place produced by *Maimonides*, *Exod.* 25. 8. and in many others.

Seder Olam Rab. ubi ſupra.

8. Thus I have now ſhewed, that even in *the Temple worſhip of the Jews*, ſome external Rites not appointed by God, were lawfully practiſed; and amongſt others, a *Sacramental geſture*, which was not uſed in the Inſtitution of the Sacrament, a *decent Veſture of white Linen*, for them who attended the Service of God therein, and a *memorative and ingaging ſign* of the Altar of Witneſs or the Altar *Ed.* and the Reader will eaſily conceive, how nearly the nature of theſe three things, reſemble and juſtifie our *geſture* at

at the Communion, the uſe of the *Surpleſs* and the *Croſs* at Baptiſm.

9. Secondly, I ſhall conſider the *Synagogue Worſhip of the Jews*, which hath a nearer alliance to the Chriſtian Worſhip. In their Synagogues they aſſembled to profeſs and own God and his Law, to hear his Word, to praiſe his Name, and call upon him, and to perform other ſuch like Duties. And this was not chiefly a *Ceremonial Worſhip*, as that of the Temple was; but a *Moral Worſhip*, or ſuch a Worſhip as conſiſted of Duties, which in the general nature of them, are perpetually obligatory upon all the Servants of God in this World, and not upon the *Jews* only, nor were they *peculiar to the Moſaical Conſtitutions*. And concerning this which was their ordinary, weekly, and indeed a principal Worſhip of God, it is truly obſerved by Mr. *Thorndike*, that *there was very little eſtabliſhed by God in the Book of the Law*. And they were alſo in ſome particulars left to their own *prudential* determinations, where the *Chriſtian Church* is not.

Of Religious Aſſemblies. c. 2.

10. A firſt inſtance I here give of the liberty of the *Jewiſh* Church, making determinations concerning things external relating to Religion, is touching the *Ordination* of the Eccleſiaſtical *Officers* of the

the Synagogal Assemblies, by *Imposition of Hands*. The Officers Ecclesiastical in these Assemblies, were those who were anciently called the *Sons of the Prophets*; or their *Elders, Scribes, Rabbins, and Doctors of the Law*. Neither the nature of their *Office* and Authority, nor especially the manner of their *Admission* thereto is any where determined in the Law of God, but depended upon the Churches Constitutions, for the preserving order and Authority in its Assemblies. And yet that all who were the *Synagogal Officers*, or who were admitted to teach there, (except the extraordinary case of Prophets) were ordained thereto by *Imposition of Hands*, and what their different manners of Ordination were, according as they committed to them different power or authority of teaching or judging, is sufficiently from the *Jewish Forms* declared by Mr. *Selden*. And this authority of Ordination was so far *approved by our Blessed Saviour*, that he declared concerning the *Scribes* and *Pharisees*, *Mat.* 23. 2, 3. That *they sit in* Moses *seat*; *all therefore whatsoever they bid you observe, that observe and do*. But though this Ordination of Elders or Rabbies among the *Jews*, was *founded upon no Divine Institution*, as is truly asserted by Mr. *Selden* the

De Synedr. l. 1. *c.* 7. *Sect.* 3, 4.

Seld. ibidem.

the ſtate of the Chriſtian Church is herein under the determination of Divine and Apoſtolical Conſtitutions.

11. A ſecond inſtance is, concerning the *Habit of the Prophets and the Sons of the Prophets.* That the Prophets uſed a *rough or hairy garment* or Mantle, which was peculiar to them, may be collected by the practice of *Elijah*, who was known by his *hairy garment*; and whoſe *Mantle* fell from him, when he was taken into Heaven, 2 *King.* 1. 8. *Chap.* 2. 13. and from the appearance of *Samuel* in his *Mantle*, 1 *Sam.* 28. 14. And even the Annotations compoſed by the Members of the Aſſembly, do probably aſſert, that when *Iſaiah* is ſaid to *go naked*, *Iſa.* 20 2. no more is intended, but that he put off his *Prophetical Robe or Mantle, ſuch as fell from Elias.* It is alſo generally acknowledged, that the Prophet *Zechary* ſpeaking of *wearing a rough garment to deceive*, doth thereby intend the ordinary Prophetical garment; ſo *Munſter*, *Vatablus*, *Caſtalio*, *Clarius*, *Druſius*, and *Grotius* do aſſert, and *Calvin* calleth that garment, *habitum Propheticum*; *Junius* ſtileth it *communem amictum prophetarum*; and *Bochartus* thinketh that it was *veſtis prophetarum propria.* That the Sons of the Prophets uſed a *particular habit*, by which they

Annot. in Iſ. 20. 2.

Zech. 13. 4.

Bochart. Hieroz. Par. 1. *l.* 1. *c.* 2.

they were easily discernable from other men, may be probably collected from 2 *Kin.* 9. 5, 6, 11, 12. And is more manifest from 1 *Kin.* 20. 35, 41. And besides these habits which were of ordinary use in their *converse*, there may some particular evidence be given, of garments peculiarly used in their *Synagogal Assemblies*: that such was their practice about our Saviours time, may appear from *Sueto-nius*, who declareth that *Tiberius commanding all Jews to depart from* Rome, forced them *Religiosas vestes comburere, to burn their garments which they used in their Religious services*, which at *Rome* could be none other than their Synagogue Worship, or School Assemblies: and *Philo Judæus* speaking of their attendance thereupon, λευχειμονοῦντες, arrayed in white apparel. And declareth the same concerning their Religious Feasts.

Sueton. in Tiberio, n. 36.

Phil. de Cherubim.

Phil. de Vit. Contempl.

12. A third instance is, their practices and injunctions of *decent gestures* in their Religious Assemblies. At the reading of the Law, *Neh.* 8. 5. Ezra *opened the Book in the sight of all the people, and when he opened it all the people stood up.* And when they praised and gave glory to God, the Levites commanded the people, *Neh.* 9. 5. *stand up and bless the Lord your God, for ever and ever.*

13. A laſt inſtance I ſhall here give, is in the *admiſſion of their chief Proſelytes*, or Members of the Jewiſh Church from amongſt the Gentiles; where beſides *Circumciſion* which God particularly enjoined in this very Caſe, *Ex.* 12. 48. and *Sacrifice* whereby they declared themſelves profeſſedly to communicate with the Temple Service, and to be *partakers of the Altar*; they alſo made uſe of *waſhing*, or a kind of *Baptiſm* in initiating theſe Proſelytes; of which we have a large account in divers modern Authors. This rite among the ancient Jews did principally *expreſs the defilement and pollution of the Gentile World*, which could alone be cleanſed by undertaking the true Religion, and the right ſervice of God. And though there might be ſome rational ground for the *expediency* of this practice becauſe waſhing was under the law of frequent uſe, in many particular Caſes of uncleanneſs, as being a means appointed for their cleanſing: yet neither from hence, nor from *Moſes ſprinkling the Iſraelites, to confirm Gods Covenant to them*, *Ex.* 24. 8. (which place the Jewiſh Writers do much urge, though that action was not performed with *water*, but with the *bloud of the Covenant* which had *water mixed* therewith, *Heb.* 9. 19.) is contained

Selden. de Syn. l. 1. *c.* 3. *Hor. Hebr. Mat.* 3. 6.

tained any ſpecial command of God, that *waſhing the Proſelytes* ſhould be a rite attending their Circumciſion, nor do we find that when *Abraham* and his Family received Circumciſion, that any ſuch *attendant rite* was joined therewith. And yet it hath been frequently acknowledged, that our Saviour chuſing waſhing or *Baptiſm* to be the *initiative rite* under the Goſpel, did ſhew thereby ſome *allowance and approbation*, of this way of admiſſion under the Law.

14. And it is manifeſt from *Buxtorfs Synagoga Judaica*, that the Jewiſh practice did receive divers other Synagogal Rites, even ſuch whereof ſome were *queſtionable* and doubtful; and others manifeſtly *vain* and ridiculous. But even theſe *miſcarriages*, under the degeneracy of their Religion, cannot render thoſe other obſervances *unallowable* which have ſo conſiderable teſtimonies of their approbation in the holy Scriptures. And thus in their Synagogue Worſhip from the inſtances I have mentioned (to which more might be added) we have evidence of the lawful uſe of external Rites, which may conduce to *preſerve the order* of Church Society, to the diſtinction and *Ornament of Miniſters*, reverent *behaviour* in the ſervice of God, and ſome

Buxt. Syn. Jud. c. 5. &c.

expreſſion of *ſolemnity* in the *ſacramental admiſſion* into the Church.

15. Thirdly, We may conſider the *natural worſhip* among the Jews or Hebrews, or their general Religious profeſſion; which was neither appropriated to their *Synagogues* or Schools, (where they were ordinarily circumciſed as *Buxtorf* obſerveth) nor to their publick Ceremonial or *Temple worſhip*: where divers inſtances may be produced.

Bux. Syn. Jud. c. 2.

16. Firſt, in the *taking an Oath*; *Abrahams* Servant uſed the Rite of *putting* his hand under his *Maſters thigh*, which *Aben Ezra* obſerved to be alſo a Cuſtom among the *Indians*. *Nehemiah* upon the like occaſion did *ſhake his lap*, deſiring God ſo to *ſhake out every man from his houſe and his labour, who performed not that promiſe*, Neh. 5. 12, 13. At other times *liſting up the hand* was uſed, in that ſolemn and Religious invocation, *Gen.* 14. 22. And it hath been obſerved, that it was an ordinary Rite among the Jews in taking an Oath, to *lay their hand upon the Book of the Law*, (as the ancient Chriſtians even in S. *Chryſoſtomes* time laid their hand upon the *Book of the Goſpel.*) But he muſt be ſatisfied with very little evidences, who thinketh that he hath found a *divine inſtitution* for theſe obſervations; which

Petit. Var. lect. l. 1. c. 16. *Fag. in Ch. Par. Ex. 23. 1.* *Except. ex Hom. Chryſ. de Juram. Tom. 6. Fr. Duc.*

which are only outward signs of Religious invocation as our words are; and therefore such *expressive signs* (so far as expediency and due solemnity shall require) may be lawfully used, though they be not particularly determined, by a Divine command.

17. Secondly, we may observe *Rites of Memorial.* Thus we not only read of *Samuel* setting up a *stone* as a *Monument* of Gods praise, and a token of remembrance that he had helped them, 1 *Sam.* 7. 12. but *Laban* and *Jacob* erected a *heap*, to be a solemn memorial and testimony of their Oath, *Gen.* 31. 46, 47. And when *Joshua* made a Covenant with the people of *Israel*, to serve the Lord, *he set up a stone under the Oak by the sanctuary of the Lord, to be a witness* and memorial of their duty and engagement, *Jos.* 24. 26, 27.

18. To these might be added, the use of *sackcloath and ashes*, as a testimony of humiliation and repentance; the use of *Imposition of hands* in their ordinary benediction; which also our Saviour practised: and I shall in another Chapter shew that the *Ring in the contract of Marriage* was used among the Jews. And yet none of these things were enjoined in the Law of *Moses*; further than what con-

concerneth the *Prieſtly benediction of* Aaron with hands lifted up, which ſome conceive to be a rite appointed in the Law.

19. And from what I have hitherto obſerved, it may be reaſonably concluded, that it is no *encroaching* upon, or oppoſing the Authority of God, if ſome indifferent and *expedient* things be determined, and received in the Church as things *uſeful*, but not as *Divine Sanctions*. And he who will deny the lawfulneſs hereof in the Chriſtian Church, muſt alſo aſſert and prove, that the coming of Chriſt hath deprived his Church, of a very conſiderable part of that *liberty* and *authority*, which the Jewiſh Church always poſſeſſed. But againſt the raſhneſs of any ſuch poſitions, the following Sections will be a *ſufficient defence*.

SECT. III.

Shewing Eccleſiaſtical Conſtitutions particularly concerning Ceremonial Rites, to be warranted by the Apoſtolical Doctrine *and* practice.

1. The ſecond main argument, is deduced from the *Apoſtles Practice and Doctrine*. Now though what they appoin-

ted

ted in the Church about any matters external, cannot be eaſily proved to be *determined* by *humane prudence* and Eccleſiaſtical Authority; becauſe they were ſo wonderfully inſpired and guided by the holy Spirit; yet if it can be ſhewed, that the Apoſtles themſelves *appointed external Rites*, attendant on the ſervice of God, which were of an *alterable and mutable nature*, this will manifeſt that the uſe of ſuch things is well conſiſtent with the Goſpel worſhip: and thence it will follow, that the *Chriſtian Church* hath liberty (as well as the Jewiſh Church had) to *determine* ſuch obſervations, ſince God hath given no ſpecial command to abridge that liberty. Here I ſhall conſider,

2. 1. The *holy kiſs*, or *kiſs of Charity*. It was a common friendly ſalutation for men to kiſs each other, both among the *Jews*; and in other *Eaſtern Countries* as hath been obſerved from *Xenophon* and *Herodotus*, and was alſo uſed in the Weſtern parts of the Empire in the time of *Tiberius*. But both S. *Paul*, *Rom.* 16. 16. and S. *Peter*, 1 *Pet.* 5. 14. required the practice of this *holy kiſs*, as a peculiar *Chriſtian Rite* and obſervation; but when and how it was uſed we muſt diſcover from the relation of the ancient Chriſtian

Writers. That it was used at their *publick Assemblies*, at the time of their *solemn Prayers*, is proved by *Grotius* from the testimonies of *Justin Martyr*, *Clemens Alexandrinus*, and *Tertullian* who calleth it *signaculum orationis the seal of Prayer*; and speaking of it as it was their ordinary expressive attestation of Unity, Peace, and Love, he saith, *Quæ oratio cum divortio Sancti osculi integra? What Prayer can be perfect, which is separated from the holy kiss?* And *Cassander* hath evidenced from S. *Austin*, *Innocent*, and divers other particular Authors, and ancient Offices, that it was especially used *at the time of the holy Communion*, sometimes before, but for the most part after the *Consecration of the Elements* and *before their distribution*; by which Ceremony Christians expressed their consent to those administrations, and their love to each other: and of this *Kiss at the Lords Supper*, *Calvin* supposeth S. *Paul* to speak, when he commandeth the *Corinthians* to *greet one another with an holy kiss*. Indeed several modern Ritualists being willingly so short-sighted, as to discern no further than the dusky and false light of the Romish Decretals doth discover, do ascribe the use of the kiss at the Communion to a latter original; some from *Leo the second*,

Grot. in Rom. 16. v. 16.

Tertul. de Orat. c. 14.

Cassand. Liturg. c. 89.

Calv. in 1 Cor. 16. 20.

cond, others from *Innocent the first*: but this appeareth to be a fond and vain imagination, because this Custom was not only mentioned by S. *Chrysostome*, but evidently referred to by the *Laodicean Council*, and is also expressed by *Justin Martyr* in his Apology, written within lesse than an hundred years after the Apostolical Epistles of S. *Paul*, and S. *Peter*. Yet that this was an *external mutable Rite*, is so far agreed upon and acknowledged, as that it is *generally disused*, because through the vanity of mens minds it was discovered at length to promote impurity and obscenity, rather than holiness and Christian love. And the Romish Custom introduced instead hereof, of kissing the *tabellam pacis*, or the *Table of Saints Pictures*, is quite another thing from the Apostolical Rite, and cannot be excused from *superstition*, from the relation it beareth to their Doctrine of the *Adoration of Saints*. And if we enquire how this ancient use of the holy kiss was most ordinarily practised, it is manifest from the testimony of the *Author of the Constitutions*, concerning the more early times of Christianity, and from *Amalarius* describing its use about 800. Years ago, that it was not *promiscuously* used, by men and women towards each other,

Conc. Laod. Can. 19.
Just. Mart. Ap. 2.
Const. Apost. l. 8. c. 11.
Amalar. de Eccl. Offic. l. 3. c. 32.

other, but *ſeparately and diſtinctly* by men towards one another, and by women among themſelves alone.

Concil. in Conc. Trul. 74. Gang. 11. Chryſ. in 1 Cor.

3. 2. Their *Agapæ or Feaſts of Charity* (which were appointed in part for the relief of the poor, but eſpecially to expreſs, continue, and increaſe *Chriſtian love and fellowſhip*, which is alſo one great deſign of the Lords Supper) were in and after the Apoſtles times uſed either immediately before as ſome affirm, concerning ſome Churches, or immediately after it, as others aſſert, and which was the more general practice, and even in the places of publick Aſſemblies. That they were *celebrated at the ſame time and place* with the Lords Supper, hath been uſually obſerved and collected from 1 *Cor.* 11. 20. --23, and from *Act.* 2. 42, 46. and from thence appeareth to have been uſed as an *Eccleſiaſtical Rite*. The uſe of theſe Feaſts of Charity was mentioned with approbation by S. *Jude*, *v.* 12. and according to ſome Greek Copies by S. *Peter*, 2 *Pet.* 2. 13. and amongſt the ancient Writers by *Ignatius Ep. ad Smyr. Tertullian*, *Apol. c.* 39. *Clemens Alexand. Pædag. l.* 2. *c.* 1. *Orig. Cont. Celſum l.* 1. *Conc. Gangr. c.* 11. and by S. *Chryſoſtom*, *Auguſtine*, and divers others, ſome placing them (as the *Paſſover* was eaten) before the

the Lords Supper, others comparing them to the *Jewish Feasts* eaten after the Passover. But when these Feasts of Charity became greatly *abused*, the Canons both of Provincial and general Councils, *excluded them from the publick places of Church Assemblies*; and as *Baronius* observeth they were abolished in *Italy*, by S. *Ambroses* Authority; as they were also not long afterwards in *Africa*, by S. *Augustine* and the other Bishops of the *Carthaginian* Province: and they became generally disused, though some appearances thereof may possibly be discerned in later times, in the Communion upon *Maundy Thursday* in divers Churches, and in the practice of the *Greek Church* upon the day of the Resurrection or Easter Day, when (as *Cassander* relateth) after the holy Communion, *allatis in Ecclesiam Epulis communiter convivantur, they have a common Banquet brought into the Church, of which they all partake.*

Conc. Laodic. c. 28. 3. Carth. 30. Trul. 74.

Baron. an. 377. n. 14. Aug. Ep. 64.

Cassand. Liturg. c. 4.

4. But against that part of this observation that the *Agapæ* were anciently *joined* with the holy Communion, it may be objected; that *Albaspinus* doth on purpose undertake to prove, that in *Tertullians* time, the *Agapæ* and the *Eucharist* were not observed together, but that the former was *celebrated at night*, from *Tertul.*

Albasp. Obs. lib. 1. Obs. 18.

tul. Apol. c. 39. and the latter *in the morning*, from *Tertul. lib.* 2. *ad Uxor. c.* 5. and *de Coron. Mil. c.* 3. But in anſwer to this we may conſider, that in that very obſervation, *Albaſpinus* himſelf admitteth, with a *Non inficias iverim*, that the *Agapæ* were *in the time of the Apoſtles* celebrated with the Euchariſt: and concerning the time of *Tertullian*, he neither undertaketh to prove that there were *no Agapæ in the Morning*, nor no *Communion in the Evening*: for thoſe very words of *Tertullian de Corona militis*, *c.* 3. *Euchariſtiæ Sacramentum etiam antelucanis cœtibus ſumimus*, do intimate, that that Sacrament was adminiſtred alſo at other times, beſides thoſe early Morning Aſ-

Cyp. Ep. 63. *n.* 48. ſemblies, and S. *Cyprian* as *Pamelius* noteth, expreſſeth their communicating in that *Carthaginian* Church both *in the*

Soer. Hiſt. Eccl. l. 5. *c.* 22. *Morning and the Evening*; as *Socrates* long after relateth the Cuſtom of *Evening Communions* in the Churches of *Egypt*, and thoſe nigh to *Thebais*. And therefore the Euchariſt and *Agapæ* might be and were joined together, as is mani-

Apol. c. 7. & 8. feſt from another place of *Tertullians Apology*.

5. And that theſe things were *mutable Rites*, and *no perpetual Laws* to the Chriſtian Church, is manifeſt not only from *general*

general Ecclesiastical practice, but also because the Scriptures give no *command* for the love Feasts, though they mention that practice with *approbation*: and the kiss which was a token of love and friendship according to the Custom of those Countries, was thence directed to be observed by those Christians, only as a *token* of their Christian *greeting and salutation*, and a testimony of their *Unity and Communion*. Yet because these things were used at the time of the *holy Communion*, as outward actions *representing* part of that Christian duty, practice, and engagement, which was signified by that holy Ordinance it self, and undertaken therein, they were in this use properly *Ecclesiastical Rites*, and do justifie the use of such external actions in the service or duties of Religion, which are useful to *excite or promote* Christian practice.

6. And besides these, the Apostles direction for men *to pray or prophesie with their heads uncovered*, was the determining an external Rite for order and decency, and not without some respect to the common expressions of *Reverence* in *Greece*, and other parts of the *Roman Empire*. The Jewish Priests performed their Temple service with their *heads covered* with their *Bonnets*, as did the High Priest

1 Cor. 11. 4.

Prieſt alſo in his *Mitre*, and it was his honour and dignity that he might not *uncover his head*, *Lev.* 21. 10. he repreſenting thereby the glory and honour of the *Meſſias*. In the Jewiſh *Synagogue worſhip*, their men conſtantly prayed with their *faces vailed*, in token of ſhame; as is manifeſt from divers teſtimonies of the *Talmudiſts*: agreeably to which Cuſtom, the holy Angels in *Iſaiah*'s Viſion, are repreſented *ſtanding* before God, and *worſhipping* with their *faces covered*. The ancient Romans uſed *uncovering the head* as an expreſſion of honour to great men; but yet from the time of *Æneas*, as *Plutarch* affirmed, they had their *heads covered* in moſt of their Religious ſolemnities. The Grecians *worſhipped with their heads uncovered*, as did the Romans alſo in their adoration of *Saturn*. But S. *Paul* conſidering the Chriſtians relation and encouragements, and the cuſtomary uſe of *vailing among women*, as fitly becoming and expreſſing their ſhamefaſtneſs, modeſty, and ſubjection; he thence from the conſideration of *comelineſs* determineth that the expreſſion of reverence which moſt befitteth the ſtate of men, in their Religious ſervice is to *uncover their heads*, and not to *vail them* both in *praying and in propheſying* (or praiſing

V. Hor. Hebr. in 1 Cor. 11. 4.

Iſ. 6. 1, 2, 3.

Plutarch. Prob. Rom. q. 10, 11, 13.

praiſing and glorifying God chiefly under extraordinary or prophetick raptures; in which ſenſe the Chaldee Paraphraſt oft expoundeth the Phraſe of *Propheſying* in the Old Teſtament, and R. D. *Kimchi* alſo as he is cited by *Druſius*.) And the conſequence hereof is this, that ſuch outward actions as tend to *expreſs a comely reverence* in the ſervice of God, may be fitly *appointed and uſed* therein, under the Goſpel diſpenſation.

Ch. Par. in 1 *Sam.* 10. 5, 6, 10. 11, 13. 16. 20, 21. 23, 24. *Druſ. in* 1 *Sam.* 10. 6.

7. But becauſe I ſhall in the following Chapter give ſome other inſtances of Apoſtolical practice, I forbear in this place to urge any more, and therefore ſhall not inſiſt upon S. *Peter* ſubmitting to have his *feet waſhed* at our Saviours command; which ſome have noted to be a *Jewiſh Paſchal Rite*, then practiſed under an *Evangelical ſignification*; nor upon the obſervations *enjoined* to the Gentile Chriſtians by the Council at *Jeruſalem*, *Act.* 15. nor upon thoſe other manifeſtly ancient Rites which are not mentioned in the Scripture, but were by the Fathers of the Primitive Church called *Apoſtolical Rites*, or *Apoſtolical Traditions*. But inſtead of proſecuting what is contained in this laſt inſtance, I ſhall obſerve that it was a current poſition, among the *chief Proteſtant Writers* of the Churches

Churches beyond the Seas, *that in points of external rite, order, and decency, ſome things were appointed by the Apoſtles in the Churches of Chriſt, which were not recorded in the holy Scriptures.* Thus *Kemnitius* aſſerteth, that it *is manifeſt from the Apoſtles writings, that they did ordain and deliver ſome Rites unto the Church, & veriſimile eſt quoſdam etiam alios externos ritus qui in ſcriptura annotati non ſunt, ab Apoſtolis traditos eſſe.* And it *ſeemeth true that there were other external Rites delivered by the Apoſtles, which are not mentioned in the Scripture.* *Beza* upon thoſe words of S. *Paul, The reſt will I ſet in order when I come,* 1 *Cor.* 11. 34. granteth that *the Apoſtle did in that Church determine other things, not mentioned in that Epiſtle, but pertinent ad ordinem Eccleſiaſticum, non ad dogmata; they were not matters of doctrine but of Eccleſiaſtical Order.* And upon the ſame words he ſaith that they appointed things *referring to order, as time, place, forms of Prayer and ſuch like; as times, places, and perſons did require.* *Zanchy* alſo citing the ſame Text by way of Objection, in his Treatiſe of the holy Scripture anſwereth, *That concerning matters of order and decency, we acknowledge many things to have been appointed in the Churches by the Apoſtles, which*

Kemnit. Exam. de Tradit. 7m Genu.

Zanch. Tract. de Sacr. Script. Qu. 8.

which are not written. Concedimus multa fuisse instituta ab Apostolis in Ecclesiis quæ non sunt scripta.

8. That command of the Apostle, 1 *Cor.* 14. 40. *Let all things be done decently and in order*; doth manifestly *suppose a power*, and command its exercise in the Church of *Corinth*, for the appointing what is requisite to those ends: and is to this purpose urged, not only in the Church of *England*, but by those other *modern Writers*, who are in high esteem with most *Non-Conformists*. *Calvin* in his Institutions, from this Scripture asserteth, *a necessity of laws made by Ecclesiastical Constitutions, because order and decency cannot otherwise be kept, nisi additis observationibus tanquam vinculis quibusdam*: and in his Commentaries he thence asserteth, that *God hath left external Rites unto our liberty that we might not account his worship to consist in them.* *Zanchy*, considering this Text, enquireth what the Apostle meaneth by decency and order? and saith among other things, *one end of decency is, that while certain rites are made use of to conciliate reverence to sacred things, we should by such helps be the more excited unto piety.* *Illyricus* himself declareth this command, to be a *foundation, first Principle or Rule, upon which Church*

Inst. l. 4. c. 10. Sect. 27.

In 1 Cor. 14. 40.

Zanch. Compen. Doct. Christiand Loc. 16.

Glos. Illyrici in Loc.

Government and Polity is to be built, and according to which it is to be modelled. And the ſame commandment is produced by the *London* Miniſters in their *Jus divinum Regiminis Eccleſiaſtici*, as giving allowance for the *ordering the circumſtantials of Church Government.* And then it muſt eſpecially warrant the orderly determining things circumſtantial, concerning *Eccleſiaſtical Aſſemblies* and *divine worſhip*, which is the ſpecial matter about which the Apoſtle treateth in that Chapter.

Part. 2. Ch 4.

SECT. IV.

The practice and judgment of the Primitive, and many Proteſtant Churches concerning Ceremonies.

1. The third Argument is, from the *judgment and practice of the Church* of God in all Ages, both in its *Primitive* Purity, and ſince the *Reformation.* And, as Chriſtian Prudence and Sobriety requireth a reverend eſteem of the *judgment* of the *Univerſal Church*; ſo Chriſtian Charity, Humility, and Modeſty, will forbid the *raſh cenſuring* the generally received *practices* in the *beſt times of Chriſtianity.* In the Primitive times, all their Canonical

Canonical *Constitutions* of Synods supposed a liberty reserved to the Church of determining things expedient; their observation of some Rites appointed by the Apostles is clear enough from the foregoing Section; and of their use of the sign of the *Cross*, of distinct *Garments* in Religious Worship, of their *gesture* at the Communion, and of *imposition* of hands in Confirmation, and the *Ring* in Marriage, I shall give a particular account ch. 4. when I come to consider the particular Rites of our Church. And that in the early times of Christianity they *stood at Prayer on the Lords Day*, and from *Easter* to *Whitsunday*, as professing the hope of the Resurrection; that they prayed with their *faces to the East* (while in the Jewish Temple Worship they always worshipped with their faces to the West;) that they used various *impositions of hands* on the *Penitents*; and gave some *initiative Symbols*, as Salt, Honey and Milk to the *Catechumens*, and newly baptized persons, with others of the like nature; is so manifest, that no man who hath read the ancient Writers can possibly make any doubt thereof. And such Rites as were orderly and fitly *established by Ecclesiastical Authority*, without any divine institution, were frequently justified and

defended by divers of the Fathers; as *Tertullian*, S. *Ambroſe*, *Baſil*, *Auſtin*, as their teſtimonies might be largely produced.

2. For inſtance ſake I ſhall ſingle out S. *Auſtin*, who (though he piouſly *complained* of the over great number of Ceremonies in his time, when they were indeed very numerous) in his Epiſtle to *Caſulanus* writing concerning faſting on the *Saturday*, he giveth this general Rule; *that in thoſe things where the divine Scriptures determine nothing certainly, the cuſtom of the people of God, or the inſtitution of our Anceſtors is to be reputed as a Law.* And afterwards he adviſeth to be careful, *leſt the clearneſs or calmneſs of Charity, be* (about ſuch things) *clouded over with the tempeſts of contention and diſputation.* And in his Epiſtle to *Januarius*, after many other things to the ſame purpoſe, he expreſſeth the *advice of St.* Ambroſe, *which he always eſteemed as a Divine Oracle; that in things which neither oppoſed Faith nor a holy life, every one was to conform to the Obſervations and Cuſtoms of that Church, where he had his preſent abode: cum Romæ ſum jejuno Sabbato, cum hic ſum non jejuno; ſic etiam tu, ad quam forte Eccleſiam veneris, ejus morem ſerva, ſi cuiq; non vis eſſe ſcandalo, nec*

Aug. Ep. 86.

Ep. 118. *c.* 2.

nec quenquam tibi. (and in his next Epistle he giveth a like direction about the same matter, which is by him called *saluberrima regula.*) And he saith he had oft *perceived with grief and sorrow, much disturbance of the weak, per quorundam fratrum contentiosam obstinationem, & superstitiosam timiditatem; through the contentious obstinacy, and superstitious fearfulness of some brethren, who stir up such contentious questions,* (about Ecclesiastical Rites of an indifferent nature in particular Churches) *that they judge nothing right, but what themselves do:* and in the same Epistle, he defendeth the *Custom* of the Church in his time of *receiving the Eucharist fasting,* which Christ instituted after meat, but gave no command that it should be afterwards so celebrated. Ep. 119. c. 18. Ep. 118. c. 6.

3. Amongst the Protestant Writers *Calvin* at *Geneva,* maketh this formal protestation: *Lest any man should raise a calumny, --- I would have all pious Readers here to bear me witness, that I do not contend about Ceremonies, which do serve only for decency and order, nor yet against such which are either Symbols of, or incitements to, that reverence which we bear to God.* *Ursin* in the Palatinate asserteth the Ecclesiastical appointment of some Rites not only to be *lawful,* but to be a *Calvin Tom. 7. Vera Ecclesiæ Reform. Ratio.* *Ursin Explic. Catec. q. 103.*

duty; *poteſt* (ſaith he) *ac debet Eccleſia quaſdam Ceremonias inſtituere.* *Rivet* in the Dutch Church ſaith, that *in the Church we uſe Ceremonies, ut geſtibus, & actionibus ſolennibus*; *Ceremonies, as geſtures and actions of ſolemnity*: and concerning ſuch things which are appointed for decency and order, he declareth his approbation of that *Rule of* S. *Auſtin*, above expreſſed from *Ep.* 118. *c.* 2. Among the *Lutherans*, *Kemnitius* not only *aſſerteth* the Churches *liberty*, in appointing adiaphorous Rites; but alſo for order ſake he *diſalloweth all liberty* of varying from them. *Et ſane ordinis & decori gratia etiam in externis adiaphoris, non eſt cuivis ſine Eccleſiæ judicio & conſenſu permittendum, ut ex petulantia pro libidine, quidvis vel omittat vel permutet.* *Gerard* both acknowledgeth *the Authority of the Church for the ordaining ſomething about the external part of worſhip*, and yieldeth that not only the Church, but even the *Apoſtles themſelves, did inſtitute in the Church, ritus quoſdam liberos, ſome free indifferent rites, appertaining to order and decency, which in ſpecie, and in particular are neither written, nor impoſed by a perpetual law*, as neceſſary for the whole Church. And in another place he ſheweth that they readily receive theſe *adiaphorous*

Catbol. Orth. Tr. 2. §. 37.

Exam. Conc. Trid. de Sacram. Can. 13.

Ger. Conf. Cathol. Lib. 1. Gener. Par. 2. c. 5. de Traditionibus.

phorous things for order and decency, *etiamsi sola Ecclesiæ consuetudine nitantur*; though they only depend upon the Custom of the Church. And *Flacius Illyricus* himself when he was out of the humour of opposition, did at last in his Gloss published from *Strazburgh* 1570. upon those words of the Apostle, *if any man seem to be contentious, we have no such custom, nor the Churches of God*, write thus. The *Apostle* (saith he) *rejecteth morose and contentious answerers, shewing that profitable rites received by grave authority, ought by no means to be contemned or plucked in pieces, though they be not built on solid demonstrations. But if any man will be stiff in his opinion, the Apostle will not contend any longer with him, but will acquiesce in the Custom of Godly and worthy men, and of the Churches of God themselves*; *idemq*; (saith he) *alios omnes pios facere debere, and that all pious men ought to do the same* is acknowledged there to be an Apostolical direction by *Illyricus* when he was out of the heat of contention in a cool and calm temper.

C. 12. de consuetudine Eccles.

Illyr. Glos. in 1 Cor. 11. 16.

4. If we view the *publick writings* of the Reformed Churches, the *Bohemian* Confession declareth them to teach, *that humane Traditions, Rites, and Customs, which do not hinder Piety, are to be preserved*

Conf. Bohem. Art. 15.

ſerved in the publick Chriſtian Aſſemblies. And in their account of the Diſcipline and Order of their Churches, they divide the matters of Religion into three heads; the *Eſſentialia*, which contain the matters of Faith, Love, and Hope; the *miniſterialia* which enclude the means of Grace, as the word of God, the Sacraments, and power of the Keys; and the *Accidentalia* by which they ſay they mean what others call *Adiaphora*, or external Ceremonies and Rites of Religion. In theſe matters *Adiaphorous*, they ſay, *they may have ſome things in uſe among them which are different from other Churches, and yet are they not willing, upon any ſmall occaſions, to allow any alteration therein; neq; ob leves cauſas quicquam mutare æquum putamus, & nemini apud nos licet inſuetas ceremonias inchoare.* And in their Ordination both of their *Biſhop*, and their *Conſenior* (who is deſigned to repreſent the *Chorepiſcopus* in ſome ancient Churches) whoſe office is like that of our *Arch-Deacon*, and their Miniſter, and their Deacon; thoſe of the ſame Order give to the perſon then ordained, their *right hand of fellowſhip*, and thoſe of the inferiour Order (when one is ordained to any of the higher degrees) give him their *right hand*, in token of *ſubjection* teſtified

Rat. Diſc. & Ord. c. 1.

Ibid. c. 1.

fied and assured by that external Rite.

5. The *Augustane* Confession, in several expressions, asserteth it *lawful* for the *Bishops or Pastors, to appoint things for Order in the Church*; and declareth that they do *retain many ancient Rites or Ceremonies*, though they complain also of the abuse of others in the Romish Church, as the Church of *England* doth: and it asserteth also *ritus illos servandos esse qui sine peccato servari possunt, & ad tranquillitatem & bonum ordinem Ecclesiæ conducunt.* The Saxon Confession treating of Rites appointed in the Church by humane Authority, declareth, that *nothing ought to be appointed against Gods word, or in the way of superstition, but that some blameless Rites for good order, both ought to be and by them are observed*; *ritus aliquos honestos boni ordinis causa factos, & servamus & servandos esse docemus.* And the Ceremonies most opposed in the Church of *England*, with more besides them, are retained both in *that and in other Lutheran Churches.* The *Helvetick* Confession asserteth, that *the Church hath always used a liberty about Rites, as being things of a middle or indifferent nature.* The *French* Church alloweth, that there be *singulis locis peculiaria instituta, prout commodum*

Conf. August. de Eccl. Potest. & Art. 15. & 21. & de discrimine cibor.

Conf. Saxon. de Tradition.

Conf. Helv. c. 27.

Conf. Gallic. c. 32.

commodum viſum fuerit; *peculiar Conſtitutions for ſeveral places, as it ſhall appear profitable.* And the *Strazburgh* Confeſſion diſcourſing about humane Traditions, or external Rites and Obſervations, which conduce to profit, though they be not expreſſed in the Scriptures, ſaith, *that many ſuch the Church of God at this day doth rightly obſerve, and as there is occaſion doth make new ones*; adding theſe ſharp words, *quas qui rejecerit, is non hominum ſed Dei, cujus traditio eſt quæcunq; utilis eſt, authoritatem contemnit, that whoſoever rejecteth theſe things, doth not contemn the authority of men but of God, of whom is every profitable Conſtitution.* Wherefore he who will yet diſclaim all Ceremonial Rites under Chriſtianity, and will eſteem them to be a peſtilential and dangerous Contagion in the Church, muſt undertake to affix both to the ancient, and latter moſt famous Churches, a *Miſerere noſtri.*

Conf. Argent. c. 14.

SECT.

SECT. V.

The ill conſequence, of denying the lawfulneſs of all Eccleſiaſtical Rites and Conſtitutions in things indifferent obſerved.

1. Though the condemning the practice and rule of the Church in all Ages, and even in the time of the holy Apoſtles and Prophets, be inconvenience ſufficient for any opinion to ſtand charged with: yet beſides this (which hath been evidenced in the two former Sections) the denying the lawfulneſs of any external Rites, 1. *Debarreth* the Church of what is really *advantagious* unto it: for ſome fit external Rites of order and decency, (provided they be not over numerous) do promote ſolemnity in the ſervice of God, and tend to excite a greater degree of ſerioufneſs, reverence and attentiveneſs. It was St. *Auſtins* obſervation, that *in Religion the outward actions of bowing the knee, ſtretching forth the hands, and falling on the ground, though they be not performed without the preceeding actions of the Soul, do much encreaſe the inward affections of the heart.* In the common affairs of the World, the *boaring his Ear* with

De Cura pro mortuis c. 5.

with an Awle, who was willing to undertake a perpetual ſervice; the giving poſſeſſion among the Jews by the *pulling off the ſhoe*, and amongſt us by divers other ways of *livery and ſeiſin*; the delivering ſome *enſign of authority* at the inſtallment of a Magiſtrate, and the *giving the hand* as a pledge of fidelity, have by the common prudence of men been judged uſeful Rites, to render thoſe undertakings and actions the more ſolemn and obſervable. Nor can there be any reaſon, why ſome external actions may not obtain the like effect in matters of Religion; eſpecially conſidering that both Prophets and Apoſtles in delivering their extraordinary Meſſages from God, thought fit frequently to make uſe of *viſible repreſentations*, that their words might thereby take the deeper impreſſion. Thus *Ezekiel carried out his ſtaff in their ſight*, and *Iſaiah walked naked* (without his ordinary Garments) when they denounced Captivity; and *Agabus* foretelling the impriſonment of S. *Paul*, *bound himſelf with his girdle*; and the Apoſtles according to the commandment of Chriſt *ſhook off the duſt of their feet*, as a teſtimony againſt thoſe Cities who received them not, which was a *rite* the Jews made uſe of towards the Cities of the Gentiles,

Act. 13. 51. *Mat.* 6. 11.

V. Hor. Heb. in Mat. 10. 14.

to

to expreſs their defilement and uncleanneſs.

2. 2. The denying the lawful uſe of external Rites, and humane obſervations in the Worſhip of God, is ordinarily attended with *partiality of judgment.* For it is almoſt generally acknowledged, that in taking a *Religious Oath*, ſome external Ceremony addeth a ſolemnity and reverence to that ſacred action: whence when other Ceremonies in publick worſhip were laid aſide, there was an *Act of Parliament as it was intituled*, that in taking an Oath it might be lawful for any man, either to *lay his hand upon the Book*, or to *hold up his right hand* (which was the way made uſe of in taking the Covenant.) And Biſhop *Saunderſon* to this purpoſe judiciouſly declareth, that *he could never receive any ſatisfaction, though he had oft conſidered with himſelf, and enquired of others, why a preſcribed form of words, and the uſe of the ſolemnity of external Rites, either ought not as things ſuperſtitious to be removed from the Religious uſe of an Oath; or elſe may not as uſeful helps of piety be retained in the other parts of Gods worſhip.* I know that ſome have told us, that an Oath is not a part of the *natural worſhip* of God, belonging to the firſt commandment; nor of the *inſtituted worſhip*

De Juram. Obl. Prel. 5. Sec. 12.

ſhip in the ſecond Commandment; but of the *reverent uſe of Gods name* in the third Commandment; and that the principal uſe of an Oath is to confirm truth and end ſtrife, and therefore it is not primarily an *Act of worſhip*, but ſecondarily and conſequentially. But indeed all this is but a plauſible miſtake. For an Oath as it is diſtinguiſhed from a bare aſſertion, encludeth a direct *profeſſion* and *particular acknowledgment of the Omniſcience of God*, and his ſearching the heart of man, and of the *juſtice of God* in the puniſhing evil, and that he is a *God of truth*, and *invocateth* him as ſuch: and this is part of the *natural worſhip of God*, or of the honour which is due to God, as being founded in the nature of God, and the natural eſtate of man. And ſince God hath *inſtituted* this way of Religious appeal to himſelf, an Oath muſt be acknowledged to enclude alſo part of the *inſtituted worſhip of God*. And the Rite of *laying the hand upon the Book, and kiſſing it*, or holding up the hand, being deſigned as a teſtimony to others, of a mans appeal to Gods Omniſcience and Juſtice; the end of that Ceremony, is primarily to manifeſt this *religious application to God*, and therefore it is attendant upon an Oath, as it is properly an *act of worſhip*.

3. 3. If

3. 3. If no external observations not commanded by God, might lawfully be admitted in the worship of God, then must the publick exercise thereof cease. For God who did expressly determine the *time and place*, for the Jewish Tabernacle and Temple worship, hath not prescribed the *same circumstances* for the Christian service. Nor hath he prescribed in all things the *method and gesture* for our Religious addresses, nor the *kind of Bread and Wine* at the Lords Supper: yet these things must necessarily be determined, where these Ordinances are celebrated. Wherefore Mr. *Baxter* acknowledgeth that *such things as these, and the decent habit for the service of God, be left to humane prudence to order, and may be determined for order, decency, and edification.* But Mr. *Rutherford* undertaking to fix the right bounds for the Churches authority, distinguisheth *things moral, and Physical circumstances*; and these latter only he granteth may be determined and ordered by the Church, but not the former. These *Physical circumstances* he saith are only *eight*, and there can be no more enumerated, *viz. time, place, person, name, family, condition, habit, gesture.* Now to omit the examining the terms of that distinction, and the considering that most of

Disp. of Humane Cerem. c. 2.

Introd. to Div. Right of Ch. Govern. Sect. 1.

of our Ceremonies (as they are called) are encluded under *habit*, and *geſture*, it is manifeſt that he hath pitifully *ſhackled himſelf*, in endeavouring the *undue Confinement* of the Churches Power. For as there can be no poſſible account, why thoſe *eight things* and no more can be determined by the Church, ſo it is very obvious to diſcern how monſtrous this enumeration is; having *needleſs redundancy*, in adding as diſtinct circumſtances from the perſon, the *name*, *family*, and *condition*; to which he might with as much reaſon have added the *age*, *ſtature*, and *complexion* of the perſon: and they have likewiſe a great *deficiency*, ſince according to his poſition it is unlawful to determine, what *verſion of the Bible* ſhall be read in the Church, what *Veſſels* ſhall be uſed in adminiſtring the Sacraments, and in what *method* Prayers, Praiſes, Pſalms, Sermons, and other Offices ſhall ſucceed to each other; the appointing of which was a chief deſign of the *Directory*. And ſome men who undertook to decry every thing referring to the worſhip of God as unlawful, unleſs it was particularly injoined in the Scripture, did advance this falſe poſition ſo far, as to aſſert that the *Directory was a breach of the ſecond Commandment; and that there*

In Edw. Gangrena. Par. 2. Er. 172.

there was no word of God to warrant the making that Book, more than Jeroboam *had, when he set up two high places, the one at* Dan, *and the other at* Bethel. Nor can such a *charge* be avoided, nor *Religion* be *secured* from confusion, unless it be admitted (which is certainly true) that some things external may *lawfully be appointed*, about the exercise thereof, though they be not *particularly enjoined of God*.

4. The reason why I have in this Section conjoined the inconveniency attending the *disallowing Ecclesiastical Constitutions* and *Observations*, together with those consequent upon the *disclaiming external Rites and Ceremonies*, is, because both these are equally impugned by almost all the arguments produced with special respect to the latter of them.

SECT. VI.

Some Objections from Reason, and from the Old Testament examined.

1. Against the lawful use of *some Ceremonies* in the Christian Church, there are mustered up a whole Army of Objections (if a weak number may be so called;) a particular answer to every of which, would be tedious and needless. For the affirming that such establishments *oppose*

the Soveraignty of Chriſt, or accuſe him of *negligence* or unfaithfulneſs; and that they make men the *Maſters of our Religion* and ſuch like; manifeſtly appear to be falſe accuſations, by conſidering that theſe external Rites are ſuch things of an *indifferent nature*, that their appointment by humane authority hath been allowed of God, both under the Old and New Teſtament, as hath been above evidenced. To aſſert that the allowance of any Ceremonies ordered by Eccleſiaſtical Prudence, chargeth the *Scripture* with *inſufficiency*, and leaveth us at a loſs (as ſome tell us that it doth) for a *Rule of Faith*, proceeded from a groſs miſunderſtanding; as if theſe indifferent things particularly conſidered, were *matters of Faith*, and that the Scripture could not be a ſufficient Rule for Faith and Holy Life, unleſs it enclude a *determination of all prudential circumſtances*, that none ſhould be ordered in the Church which are not there appointed. To decry all ſuch things as *Unlawful*, becauſe in our Church there hath been much *ſtrife and contention* about them, to the breach of the Churches Peace; may appear to be a very weak argument, from obſerving that both the Jewiſh and the Apoſtolical and Primitive Chriſtian Churches, and

V. Hooker. Eccleſ. Pol. l. 3.

ſeveral

ſeveral *Lutheran* Churches of late have enjoyed a very peaceable ſtate, together with ſuch Eccleſiaſtical Conſtitutions; but the more manifeſt cauſe of ſtrife and contention, is from *miſunderſtanding* in ſome, and from *want of humility and obedience* in others; and theſe perſons have found matter ſufficient for them to make a *breach* of the Churches *Peace*, in other points beſides Ceremonies.

2. As to that Objection, that the allowing any Authority for the appointing ſuch things in the Church, will leave its power in a *boundleſs and unlimited ſtate*; if this was of any force, it would equally oppoſe all other commanding Authority in every ſuperior relation in the World. And as *Secular Rulers* have Authority to make Laws for the Peace and Order of Kingdoms, but not to exerciſe oppreſſion nor to change the nature of Good and Evil, nor to make any divine Precepts; ſo *Rulers in the Church* are allowed to direct and appoint what tendeth to good order and decency; but may not deliver any thing as Gods command which is not, nor alter any of his Precepts and Inſtitutions, nor enjoin things needleſſy burdenſom. How the allowing ſome Ceremonies in the Chriſtian Church is a quite different thing from the *reducing*

the Ceremonial law of the Jews, hath been ſhewed in the firſt Section of this Chapter; wherefore I now come to examine the Scripture evidence which ſome plead againſt Eccleſiaſtical Rites and Conſtitutions.

3. *Obj.* 1. The ſin of *Nadab* and *Abihu*, for which *fire came out from the Lord and devoured them, was their offering ſtrange fire before the Lord, which he commanded them not.* *Lev.* 10. 1, 2. And this is ſuppoſed by them who urge this Objection, to be only an outward rite or circumſtance of worſhip, in making uſe of that fire in the ſervice of God which was *not enjoined*, and about which he had made *no determination.*

Cypr. Ep. 72. *& de Unit. Eccl.* *Anſ.* 1. It was much more truly acknowledged of old, that the ſin of *Nadab* and *Abihu* was, that what they did was *Dei traditione contempta, in deſpite of what God had declared to the contrary*; and therefore their ſin hath been frequently paralleld, with the ſin of *Corah, Dathan and Abiram.* And whereas the Scripture declareth their ſin, to be a doing that *which God commanded them not*: that Phraſe in the holy Scriptures (*which I commanded them not*) doth not denote, Gods having enjoined nothing about that particular action, but ordinarily by a

Iren. adv. Her. l. 3. c. 44.

Meioſis

Meiosis intimateth, Gods having *severely prohibited it.* Thus God declareth their building high places of *Tophet* and of *Baal* to burn their Sons and their Daughters, to be *things he commanded them not*, *Jer.* 7. 31. *Jer.* 19. 5. and the same expression is used, concerning *committing Adultery with their Neighbours Wives*, and *speaking lying words in the name of the Lord*, *Jer.* 29. 23. and concerning *the serving other Gods, and worshipping the Sun, Moon, and the Host of Heaven*, *Deut.* 17. 3. all which things were vehemently forbidden in the Law of God. Wherefore some have thought that the sin of *Nadab* and *Abihu* consisted *in Offering strange Incense*, which God had expressly forbidden. *Ex.* 30. 9. Which opinion is declared by *Fagius*; and doubtless this was the judgment of *Josephus*, though the ordinary Copies of *Josephus* express it to be their Offering other (θυμάλων) *Sacrifices* than *Moses had commanded*; but that it should be read θυμιαμάλων *Incense*, is manifest by comparing *Josephus* with the *Hebrew*, and the *Septuagint*. Others have observed, that before that time God had appointed *Aaron* only, and not *his Sons* to offer any incense unto him; and therefore it might be an act of great presumption in them: and when *Corah* presumed

Fag. in loc.

Joseph. Ant. l. 3. c. 10.

to *invade* the Prieſts office to *offer incenſe*, both the *Samaritan Verſion*, and the *Septuagint*, reading the Hebrew with a little variation of the points in אש *Num.* 16. 37. called that which he offered, *ſtrange fire*. And ſome others have thought them ſo *boldly irreverent*, as againſt the command of God, to thruſt themſelves into the *holy of holies*. This is collected by ſome of the Jewiſh Doctors from *Lev.* 16. 1, 2, 3. and is admitted by *Junius*.

Jun. in Lev. 10. 1.

4. *Anſ.* 2. But admitting that their ſin conſiſted in making uſe of *that fire* which God did not allow, we muſt further aſſert with *Munſter*, that God having cauſed *fire* miraculouſly to *conſume the Sacrifice* upon the Altar, *Lev.* 9. 24. and commanded that the *fire upon the Altar ſhould be continually burning* (to wit, for the uſe of Gods ſervice) and *ſhould never go out*, *Lev.* 6. 12, 13. their offering other fire, was an oppoſing of Gods command. For if any ſhould imagine that when God had commanded *incenſe to be offered*, which muſt be offered with fire; he did leave it undetermined what fire they ſhould make uſe of; and that in this caſe the *choice* of any ſort of fire, becauſe it was *not commanded*, was a grievous ſin; this would repreſent the holy and righteous will

will of God, as contradictory to it ſelf, and as inevitably forcing the Prieſts to be guilty of ſin, becauſe upon this unreaſonable ſuppoſition their *offering incenſe with fire*, which was their *duty* and commanded of God, muſt neceſſarily be accounted a *ſin and diſpleaſing to God.* And if ſuch poſitions were admitted, they will bring after them a numerous train of manifeſt abſurdities and contradictions; as that the Prieſt ought as God had commanded to *burn wood upon his Altar*, but might in no wiſe make uſe of any ſort or kind of wood to that purpoſe, becauſe God had not particularly enjoined it; and the like may be ſaid of the *kind of Bread and Wine* in the Lords Supper; and in divers other things under the time of Chriſtianity.

5. *Obj.* 2. God commanded *Deut.* 12. 32. *Whatſoever I command you obſerve and do, thou ſhalt not add thereto, nor diminiſh from it. Anſ.* 1. That theſe words do properly condemn on the one hand *ſuperſtition*, or the making any thing a part of Religion and the Law of God, which indeed is not; and on the other hand *want of Religious reverence*, in neglecting obedience to what God had enjoined and commanded. But that divers things referring to the worſhip of God, were al-

lowably under the Jewiſh diſpenſation ordered, as matters of *decency and expediency*, by humane prudence, I have in a former Section given ſufficient teſtimony: and if ſuch appointments had not been allowable, their *Synagogue worſhip*, which was thereby guided and directed, muſt neceſſarily have been altogether *impracticable*, or at leaſt *utterly confuſed*. And it is not amiſs obſerved by Biſhop *Whitgift*, that that command *Deut.* 12. did *as well concern the Judicial part of the Moſaical Law as the Ceremonial*; and therefore it may with as much plauſibleneſs be urged, to prove that no *ſecular laws* may be made under Chriſtianity, as that *no Eccleſiaſtical Conſtitutions* ſhould be therein eſtabliſhed; unleſs it can be ſhewed, that under the Goſpel the Divine Law hath particularly enjoined *all circumſtances of worſhip*, and Rules of order in all Eccleſiaſtical Caſes, where it is preſumed he hath not preſcribed a *Platform of civil polity*. And yet even in matters *judicial* alſo the Jewiſh Doctors, as is manifeſt from their *Bava Kama*, *Sanhedrin*, *Maccoth*, and other Talmudical Treatiſes, did give *divers reſolutions* of various particular caſes and circumſtances, not expreſſed in the Law of *Moſes*: and both theſe deciſions, and their סיג לתורה or their Conſtitutions

P. 1. Ch. 6. div 11.

ſtitutions to be a *hedge of the Law*, (as when the Law did not allow *above forty ſtripes* to him who was to be adjudged to be ſcourged, their Doctors required them never to exceed *thirty nine*, not thereby altering Gods Law, but taking care leſt it ſhould by miſtake be violated) are well allowed of by Chriſtian Writers. However, ſince the Goſpel requireth a *care of order and decency* in the Chriſtian Church, to deny this liberty, would be a *diminiſhing* from its commands, but to grant it is no *addition* to them. Wherefore though *ſuperſtitious* placing Religion where we ought not, and *irreverent* neglect, or making no Conſcience of any Divine Inſtitution, are ſinful, *prudential Conſtitutions* remain lawful.

Maec. c. 1. Sect. 1, 3.

Grot. in Deut. 25. 3. & 2 Cor. 11. 24. Coccei in Mac. c. 3. n. 12.

SECT. VII.

Other Objections from the New Teſtament cleared.

1. From the New Teſtament it hath been objected, 1. That our Saviour defended his Diſciples, *for not obeying the tradition of the Elders, which required them to waſh before meat. Mat.* 15. 2. *Anſ.* As this tradition did not refer to the *order* of the *publick worſhip of God*, in

in Religious Aſſemblies; ſo the true reaſon why our Saviour defendeth his Diſciples in their practiſing againſt this tradition, was becauſe waſhing before meat was enjoined by them, as a *proper rule of Religion* and of Purity. For as in general it hath been obſerved by *Druſius* and Dr. *Lightfoot*, that many of the Jews eſteemed not the written Law, but that given by tradition to be their *foundation*, and chief *Rule of Doctrine*, and declared, that he *who tranſgreſſed the words of the written Law was not guilty, but he who tranſgreſſed the words of the Scribes was guilty*: ſo in this particular diſcourſe our Saviour charged them with *teaching for Doctrines the commandments of men*, *v.* 9. and declareth againſt their errour and falſe Doctrine, *v.* 20. *that to eat with unwaſhen hands defileth not the man.* So that the queſtion between our Saviour and the Scribes and Phariſees was this, Whether it was to be admitted as a *Doctrine*, that *eating with unwaſhen hands defileth the man?* and our Saviour juſtifying his Diſciples in this Caſe, doth declare, that whereſoever *falſe Doctrines* are obtruded as parts of the Law of God, it can be no mans duty to receive them, and practiſe upon them: which is that our Church alſo profeſſeth.

In Loc.

2. But

2. But our Saviour was ſo far from *oppoſing prudential Rules* and Obſervations, for the orderly performance of Religious ſervices; that himſelf frequently practiſed ſuch things, according to the Cuſtom, and Conſtitutions of the Jews. Thus as the Jewiſh Doctors *ſat* in their Synagogues when they taught the people, our bleſſed Lord ordinarily *uſed the ſame geſture* in teaching. He alſo ordinarily joined in their *Synagogue worſhip*, which was ordered by the Rules of Eccleſiaſtical Prudence, and obſerved the *geſture* and other Rites of the Jewiſh Paſsover, which the Authority of their Elders had eſtabliſhed for order and decency. And whereas in the Jewiſh Synagogues, and Schools, their Doctors uſed to *ſit about in a ſemicircle*; and their Scholars before them upon lower Seats, to whom the aſking of Queſtions was allowed; our Saviour alſo *in the Temple* (which in the holy Scriptures oft encludeth the whole Court and building of the Temple, among which were Religious Schools and Synagogues) *ſate ἐν μέσῳ in the middle of the Doctors, hearing them and asking them Queſtions*, Luk. 2. 46.

3. Some have alſo againſt the uſe of external Rites in the worſhip of God, urged thoſe words of our Saviour, *Joh.* 4. 23. *The hour cometh and now is when the*

the true worſhippers, ſhall worſhip the Father in ſpirit and truth: collecting thence, that the Goſpel worſhip is ſo wholly ſpiritual, that it doth not admit outward Rites and ſigns. *Anſ.* 1. This muſt needs be a falſe conſtruction of theſe words, which would tend to diſclaim the two *New Teſtament Sacraments*, the open and viſible *profeſſion* of Faith, the publick meeting in *Church Aſſemblies*, the praiſing of God and praying with the *voice*, the *reading and hearing* Gods word, reverent *geſtures* in Religious ſervice, and ſuch like neceſſary parts of Religious duty, in all which there is uſe of bodily actions and external ſigns. 2. Our bleſſed Lord by theſe words of *worſhipping the Father in ſpirit and truth*, expreſſeth that worſhip which the Goſpel directeth; this is often called the *truth*, and the *worſhipping of God in the Spirit*, *Gal.* 3. 3. *Phil.* 3. 3. and is oppoſite to the *falſe worſhip* of the *Samaritans*, and different from the *ſerving* of God in *Jewiſh* Figures, yet it both admitteth and requireth external expreſſions of reverence. And in this place our Saviour declareth, that under the Goſpel, the worſhip of God ſhould be ſo properly ſuitable to God who is a *Spirit*, that it ſhould not be confined to any one particular place, and therefore neither the

Jewiſh

Jewish Temple nor mount *Gerizim* (about which places of worship Christ then discoursed with the Samaritan Woman) should be the peculiar place for divine adoration. Because God who is a Spirit would under the Gospel be so spiritually known and honoured, that he would not in any singular and *peculiar place*, fix any special outward *Symbol* of his *divine presence*, as in the Jewish dispensation he had done in the Temple, over the mercy Seat: nor would he endure to be worshipped under the representation of a *corporeal image*, as the *Samaritans* in Mount *Gerizim* did worship God, in the form or image of a *Dove*: as hath been observed by Mr. *Mede*, and is declared concerning them in the *Talmud* in *Cholin*, and by the Jewish Chronicler in *Tzemach David*, whose testimonies and words are produced by *Bochartus*. Indeed the Learned *Bochartus* (as did also *Vossius*) accounteth this charge upon the *Samaritans* to be a *Fable*, because it could not consist with their owning the Law of *Moses*, and is not mentioned either in the Scriptures, or in *Josephus*. But considering how little *Josephus* wrote, that hath any kind of relation to the *Samaritan worship*, and that our Saviour chargeth them with a miscarriage about the object of their worship,

Mede Disc. on *Joh.* 3. 23.

Bochart. Hieroz. Part. poster. l. 1. *c.* 1.

Vossius de Idololatr. l. 1. *c.* 23.

Joh. 4. 22. worship, *Ye worship*, saith he, *ye know not what*; considering also that the worshippers at *Bethel*, by whom the *Samaritans* were instructed, did before their Captivity worship God there by *an Image*, and that the *Assyrians*, *Syrians*, and others Neighbouring upon the *Samaritans*, as *Bochartus* sheweth, did chuse the *form of a Dove* to be the Image and resemblance of God; there is no just reason to question the evidence of the Jewish Writers concerning the *Samaritans*.

Bochart. ibidem.

4. It hath been also objected against all *Ecclesiastical Constitutions*, that the Apostle blamed the *Colossians*, *Col.* 2. 20, 21. *Why as though living in the World are ye subject unto Ordinances*, such as he mentioneth in the next verse, *Touch not*, (or eat not) *tast not*, *handle not*. *Ans.* This place concerneth not prudential Rules of order, but it blameth the *Colossians*, that they should suffer their minds to be deluded, and their practices to be ensnared and perverted, by *false positions delivered as Doctrines*; and this is observed to be the sense of δογματίζεσθαι *v.* 20. and these things were called the *Commandments and Doctrines of men*, *v.* 22. and *will-worship*, *v.* 23. because they were delivered as proper divine Commandments.

Davenant. & Zanch. in Loc.

Whitak. Cont. 4. Qu. 7. c. 3.

And

And that this was the cause of the Apostles reproving the *Colossians*, may be further manifest, because the Apostles themselves upon a *prudential and Christian account*, enjoined the Gentiles to *forbear* some sorts of *meat*, the observing of which Apostolical Constitution (which did not doctrinally declare those things themselves to be unclean) was in no wise condemned by S. *Paul* writing to his *Colossians*.

5. That place of S. *James*, *Jam.* 4. 12. *There is one Lawgiver who is able to save and to destroy*, doth appropriate to God the Authority of establishing, and executing such Laws, the obeying or disobeying which, is the sure way to eternal life, or destruction, because they are his Laws: but this Scripture having no peculiar respect to the *worship of God* in publick Assemblies, doth no more condemn *Ecclesiastical Constitutions* of Order in the Church, than either the *civil Sanctions* of secular Governours, or the *Domestick commands* of Parents or Masters. And even *Calvin* with some respect to this place of S. *James*, asserteth in his Institutions, that in the *great matters* of Christianity, there is *unicus vitæ magister*, *one only who is to rule and command our life*; *but in externa Disciplina & Ceremoniis*,

Inst. l. 4. c. 10. Sect. 7, & 30.

nies, in matters external concerning Diſcipline and Ceremonies, he hath not thought fit to preſcribe every particular thing, but hath left us to be guided by general rules.

6. I know that ſome who urge this place of S. *James*, would thence conclude that none beſides God, have any power or Authority, by their commands, to *bind the Conſciences* of men. Now though this Text ſpeaketh nothing expreſly of *Conſcience* or its *obligation*, I ſhall concerning that matter add, that Eccleſiaſtical Conſtitutions do no otherwiſe *bind the Conſciences of men* (ſo far as concerneth the nature of the obligation) than the commands of *Magiſtrates, Parents and Maſters* do, though they have ordinarily the ſtronger motives, with direct reſpect to the Peace and Order of the Church, and the edification of its Members. And it muſt be acknowledged that no humane Authority, can *bind the judging power* of Conſcience, ſo that it is obliged to judge that a duty, which is thereby commanded, without having liberty to conſider of its lawfulneſs: and this is manifeſtly the ſenſe of ſeveral Proteſtant Writers, when they ſay that God only hath power *to bind the Conſcience.* But that humane Laws and commands *do ſecondarily and conſequentially bind*

bind the Conscience, to take care of practising what is lawfully commanded, is that which can never be denyed. It would certainly sound harsh to a Christian Ear, if any shall assert that a Child is not bound in *Conscience*, to do any particular lawful thing which his Father commandeth him; it being all one to assert that it is *not his duty*, and that he is not bound in Conscience to do it. But if he be bound in Conscience to do that upon his Fathers command, which he was not bound to undertake without that command, it must needs be his command, which layeth that *obligation upon Conscience*, secondarily and consequentially, or with a respect unto Gods general command of obedience.

7. In this sense it is not unusual with Protestant Writers beyond the Seas, (as well as with divers of our own Nation, as particularly Bishop *Saunderson de Obligatione Conscientiæ*, and Bishop *Taylor* very largely in his *Ductor Dubitantium*) to assert, that the injunctions of our Superiours bind the Conscience. *Ursin* in his *Explicatio Catechetica*, asserteth the *Constitution of the Magistrate to bind the Conscience, that is* (saith he) *by reason of the command of the Magistrate, it becometh necessary to be performed, and cannot be* Duct. Dubit. l. 3. c. 1. rule 15. & 5. & Ch. 4. rule 5. Ex. Cat. qu. 69.

neglected without the offence of God, though it be no caſe of Scandal. And in his *Loci Theologici* he to the ſame purpoſe declareth, *edicta Magiſtratûs obligant conſcientias*, and *abſq; ſcandalo obligatur conſcientia ad harum legum obſervationem.* To the ſame purpoſe may *Paræus* be produced. And *Alſted* very well noteth that *humane Laws* mediately or under God do *bind the Conſcience* even as an *Oath*, *Vow*, *or promiſe made by a mans ſelf doth.*

In prac. 7. de Cultu Dei.

Alſted Theol. Caſ. c. 2. Reg. 2.

8. I ſhall not inſiſt upon that objection from *Heb.* 3. 5, 6. which expreſſeth the *faithfulneſs of Chriſt* to be more glorious than the faithfulneſs of *Moſes*, from whence it hath been with more *manifeſt violence*, than *ſtrength of argument*, concluded, that under the Goſpel which is perfectly and compleatly delivered by Chriſt, there is no place left for any *prudential Conſtitutions*, which were (ſay they) wholly excluded under the *Moſaical Law.* But I ſuppoſe I have beyond all contradiction *evinced*, that under the *Miſaical Law*, there were divers things appointed by Eccleſiaſtical Authority. And that *Moſes's faithfulneſs* conſiſted in delivering the Law as he *received* it, and not in the *Compleatneſs* of enjoining every particular circumſtance in the Church, will appear evident; becauſe otherwiſe he

he could not be accounted as faithful, with reſpect to their *Synagogue worſhip* as to their *Temple worſhip*. And it may be further noted, that the *numerous divine commands* about matters external, referring to the Temple worſhip, which was the *Law of Commandments contained in Ordinances*, was no part of the priviledge but of the *bondage* of the Jewiſh Church, in which the Goſpel Church was not deſigned to be conformable thereto. *V. Sanderſ. de Obl. Conſ. præl. 6. Sect. 30.*

9. What is uſually produced upon this ſubject from the fourteenth Chapter to the Romans will fall more directly under conſideration in the following Chapter where I deſign to give a particular account of the true ſenſe thereof.

10. But what hath been here ſaid, can be no pretence of excuſe for the *Rites of the Romiſh Church*; where beſides their unreaſonable and burdenſom number, divers of them are *evil* in their nature: many of them being *Sacramental* and deſigned to be *operative* of Grace and ſpiritual help: and others being *oppoſite* to plain duties of Religion, ſuch are the making *images of the Trinity*, and of the Saints for *adoration*; the ſuppreſſing the *Cup* to the Laity, a Rite of Chriſts appointment in the Euchariſt; the *adoration* of the Sacrament as *tranſubſtantiated*:

and divers others being manifeſtly *ſuperſtitious*, as might be evidenced in their various *conſecrations* (as they account them of Bells, Candles, Water, Salt, Chriſm, *&c.*) *Proceſſions* and ſuch like.

CHAP.

CHAP. II.

Of external Rites and Conſtitutions, as ſignificant, enjoined, ſcrupled, or having been abuſed.

SECT. I.

Of external Rites as ſignificant.

1. OUR Liturgy declareth the *Ceremonies retained in our Church, to ſerve to a decent order and godly Diſcipline, and to be ſuch as are apt to ſtir up the dull mind of man, to the remembrance of his duty to God, by ſome notable and ſpecial ſignification, whereby he might be edified.* Thus kneeling at the Communion is deſigned to *expreſs* Humility and Reverence; the Croſs at Baptiſm to be a *memorative token* of engagement to the Chriſtian Life, and the Miniſterial Habit to be a *teſtimony* of peculiar reſpect and honour, to the worſhip and ſervice of God. And if any from the White Linen take occaſion to *meditate*, and think of the purity of Divine Worſhip, and the Chriſtian Life; and that as White Linen is changed *Com. Pray. of Ceremonies.*

from its natural *greenneſs and moiſture*, to become uſeful and comely, through much induſtry, waſhing, and the influence of the Sun: ſo the corrupt ſtate of fallen man, may become *renewed unto holineſs* by the power of divine Grace, and ſerious Chriſtian diligence: ſuch conſiderations as this, though not commanded in this Church, may well be approved and defended.

T. C. Repl. p. 136. Linc. Apol. 1605. Alt. Damaſc. c. 9. p. 512. Mr. Baxt. Diſp. of Cerem. c. 2. Excep. of Presb. p. 9.

2. But ſuch *external inſtituted ſigns* which by their ſignification do either *teach* any duty, or *excite* to the performance thereof, have been generally decryed with ſome earneſtneſs by the Non-Conformiſts under the name of *Myſtical teaching ſigns*, ſometimes as *Jewiſh Rites*, and ſometimes as *new Sacraments*. Whereas it ſeemeth very ſtrange that an uſeful *ſignificancy*, or its conduciblenes to promote good, ſhould become a crime. Surely it is altogether as reaſonable, that ſuch an Ornament of the body which might otherwiſe be approved, ſhould become utterly *intolerable*, if it be of any *advantage* for warmth or health; as that any appointment for order and decency in matters of Religion ſhould be thought altogether *inſufferable*, becauſe of its tendency towards *edification*, or any ſpiritual benefit. Wherefore

3. Con-

3. Conſider, 1. That the denying all lawfulneſs of uſing any external thing not commanded of God, as a *ſign* either to *help* our *underſtandings* or *excite* our *affections*, doth very much tend to the prejudice of Religion and Chriſtianity. For this would condemn the uſe of *Parables* and Similitudes, which our Saviour following the Cuſtom of the Jewiſh Teachers, did frequently expreſs. And this would condemn a very uſeful part of *Chriſtian meditation*; as if he who *looketh* upon the *Earth* no otherwiſe than the Beaſt doth, might be well approved of; while he who fixing his eyes thereupon, conſidereth that he was *taken out* of the Earth, and muſt *return* thither, and thence entreth upon an humble thoughtfulneſs of his own *frailty*, muſt be condemned; or as if it were a heinous thing for a Chriſtian when he looketh up to *Heaven*, immediately to entertain thoughts thereupon, of Chriſts being *aſcended* thither, and how much he is obliged that his *affections and converſation* ſhould be above.

4. *Conſ.* 2. The lawful uſe of ſome other *viſible ſigns* beſides geſtures, is neceſſarily allowed in the right exerciſe of Chriſtianity. I ſuppoſe none will condemn our *kneeling at Prayer*, though it be

primarily deſigned to teſtifie our lowlineſs, reverence, and humility; and to own and acknowledge the Soveraignty and Majeſty of God; or *ſtanding to hear*, thereby to expreſs or excite Chriſtian attention: the *liſting* up the *hands* or *eyes* in Prayer out of true devotion, is not therefore blameable, becauſe it is a ſign of a ſtedfaſt hope and confidence in God, and of expectation from him; nor may the Publican's *ſmiting his hand upon his breaſt*, be thought the worſe of, becauſe it encludeth a pathetick and affectionate acknowledgment, of his unfeigned humiliation and ſorrow for ſin. We often read of the Apoſtle *beckoning with his hand*, to move his Auditors to attention: and I ſuppoſe few will be ſo bold, as to cenſure the Cuſtom of the Primitive Chriſtians, who prayed as *Tertullian* declareth, *manibus expanſis quia innocuis, capite nudo quia non erubeſcimus*, and who frequently ſtretched out their hands in Prayer *compoſing themſelves* thereby to a *ſuitableneſs to Chriſt dying on the Croſs*, *Dominica paſſione modulantes*; and having in that poſture an earneſt intentneſs of mind upon our Saviours Paſſion, when his hands were *ſtretched out*. But dare any undertake to blame that woman, whom our Saviour commended and approved,

Act. 21. 40. *Ch.* 26. 1.

Tertul. Apol. c. 30.

Tertul. de Orat. c. 13.

proved, who *kiſſed the feet of our Lord, and anointed them with Ointment, and who waſhed them with her tears, and wiped them with the hair of her head,* as a teſtimony of religious reverence, honour and vehement love to the Son of God by whom ſhe obtained remiſſion of ſins? or to condemn her who to a like purpoſe *poured that Ointment of ſpikenard upon his head,* concerning which he declared, that *wherever the Goſpel ſhould be preached, throughout the whole World, that which ſhe had done ſhould be ſpoken of for a memorial of her, Mar.* 14.3,--9. Wherefore outward voluntary actions, deſigned to *ſignifie ſome Religious thing,* ought not univerſally to be diſclaimed. And it will concern them who condemn external Rites meerly upon account of their *ſignification,* which might otherwiſe be admitted; to conſider how they can allow according to this opinion, the uſe of *proper and expreſſive words* in the ſervice of God, to be preferred before *nonſenſe* and *impertinencies*: (ſince words are properly ſigns of things as S. *Aug.* and *Rabanus* have noted, and the *particular words* appropriated to all parts of Divine worſhip are not enjoined by God himſelf) and whether this poſition will not go far, toward the condemning *Religious and devout behaviour*

Luk. 7. 38, 50.

Aug. de Doctr. Chriſt. l. 3. *c.* 1, 2, 3. *Rab. Maur. de Inſt. Cler. l.* 3. *c.* 8. *&c.*

haviour in Chriſtian Aſſemblies, becauſe it is an outward and viſible expreſſion of a pious frame of mind; whereas ſuch external actions rightly uſed with a due ſignificancy are *teſtimonies and incentives of* Piety and Religion, but without ſuch a ſignification, are either *Hypocritical*, or at leaſt *vain* and empty.

5. But ſome diſtinguiſh here between ſuch things which have a *natural ſignificancy*, as Religious geſtures; and ſuch things as ſignifie by *humane Conſtitutions and Conſent*; the former they do admit but not the latter. But this diſtinction is to little purpoſe; partly becauſe there can be no ſufficient reaſon given, why the latter ſhould be *univerſally diſallowed*, while the former are approved; partly becauſe moſt things ſuppoſed to have a natural ſignificancy, did derive their original ſignification from *humane cuſtom* and *conſent*, as reverent geſtures, and uncovering the head; and partly becauſe divers *particular things above mentioned*, which cannot be diſapproved, cannot be pretended to have a natural ſignification, to which *laying the hand on the Book* in an Oath, and others more may be added.

6. *Conſ.* 3. The diſallowing all external ſignificative Rites in Gods ſervice, is

is a thing oppoſite to the general ſenſe of the *Church of God* in all former Ages. That divers ſignificative Rites were lawfully uſed in the *Jewiſh* Church without any Divine Inſtitution, is ſufficiently manifeſt from the inſtances given in the former Chapter, and ſuch were alſo the Apoſtolical Rites of the *Love-kiſs*, the *Feaſts of Charity*, and the having mens *heads uncovered*, and not veiled. The judgment of *Calvin* and *Zanchy* approving ſuch Ceremonies of Eccleſiaſtical appointment were alſo in that Chapter produced; and the ſame may be obſerved in *Urſin Explic. Catech. q.* 103. and *P. Martyr, Ep. Hoopero.* The *Bohemian* Confeſſion teacheth *that ſuch Rites by whomſoever they were introduced, ought to be preſerved which advantage Faith, the worſhip of God and other things that are good amongſt Chriſtians*; with which agreeth the *Strazburgh* Confeſſion *Cap.* 14. Some ſignificative Rites of the Ancient Chriſtian Church, were alſo mentioned in the foregoing Chapter, to which may be added, the frequent uſe of the *Trinal Merſion* in Baptiſm, as a profeſſion of the *Trinity* and of Conformity to the Death of Chriſt, which continued three days; and this is uſed in divers Proteſtant Churches at this day: they alſo ſometimes purpoſely

Art. 15.

uſed

uſed the *ſingle Merſion*, to teſtifie the Unity of the Godhead. Sometimes as appeareth by the words of *Hincmarus* the perſon to be baptized (ſuppoſing him adult) was to *give up his name in writing*, to ſignifie by that action his willingneſs and deſire to undertake Chriſtianity, and to obtain Baptiſm. And very anciently the perſon receiving Baptiſm did then *change his Garments*, arraying himſelf in *white*, as an admonition to him that he then changed his ſtate, and undertook the innocency of the Chriſtian profeſſion: this Cuſtom was obſerved by *Gratian*, from *Rabanus*, and S. *Ambroſe*; and is thought by a learned man of our own Nation, to be as ancient as the Apoſtles themſelves, and to be alluded unto, in the uſe of thoſe Scripture Phraſes, of *putting off the old man with his deeds, and putting on the new man*, *Col.* 3. 9, 10.

In c. 2. q. 1. c. legum.

De Conſecr. Diſt. 4. c. poſt baptiſmum & Acceptiſti.

Mr Thorndike Right of the Church c. 4.

7. The main Objection particularly directed againſt ſignificant Ceremonies, is that ſuch things have a reſemblance of *ſacraments*; but no Eccleſiaſtical Authority, nor any perſon below Chriſt himſelf, can conſtitute or appoint a Sacrament. Indeed S. *Auguſtine* ſometimes ſpeaketh of Sacraments as being nothing elſe but *verba viſibilia*, *viſible words*, and other where ſaith, that *ſigns referring to divine*

Cont. Fauſt. l. 19. c. 16.

Ep. 5. ad Marc.

divine things are called Sacraments; but theſe expreſſions were noted by *Kemnitius* as inſtances to ſhew, that S. *Auguſtine* uſed the word *Sacrament*, in a *great latitude of ſenſe*; this being an Eccleſiaſtical word, not always taken in the ſame ſtrictneſs of ſignification. And S. *Aug.* doth there peculiarly ſpeak of a *certain kind of ſigns, viz.* the Jewiſh Ceremonies appointed by the Divine Law, which I have above obſerved to enclude ſomewhat *Sacramental.* *Kemnit. Exam. de Sacram. Can.* 1.

8. But that we may rightly apprehend, how far ſignificative ſigns are lawfully *appointed* in the Church, I ſhall diſtinguiſh ſuch ſigns referring to matters of Religion, into ſo many *ſeveral ranks or Claſſes*, as may be ſufficient for the clearing my preſent enquiry. Wherefore

9. Firſt, ſome external ſigns are appointed to *ratifie, ſeal and confirm the Covenant of God*, and to tender and *exhibit* the Grace of that Covenant, or Chriſt himſelf unto us. And theſe ſigns are properly *Sacraments*, according to the definition thereof in our Church Catechiſm; to be *outward and viſible ſigns of inward and ſpiritual Grace, given unto us, ordained by Chriſt himſelf, as a means whereby we receive the ſame, and a pledge to aſſure us thereof.* Accordingly Baptiſm

as

as a means of Grace doth *exhibit remiſſion* of ſins, *Act.* 2 2.16. and *Salvation*, 1 *Pet.* 3. 21. and the Lords Supper exhibiteth the *New Teſtament* in Chriſts bloud, and is the *Communion of the body and bloud of Chriſt*, 1 *Cor.* 10. 16. *Ch.* 11. 25. And *Rabanus Maurus* deſcribing a Sacrament, ſaith, that therein *ſub integumento rerum corporalium, virtus divina ſecretius operatur ſalutem.* And that this is the common Doctrine of the Proteſtant Writers concerning Sacraments, (which they defend, againſt the *Calumnies* of the Papiſts, who charge them with aſſerting the Sacraments to be only ſignificative ſigns, but not exhibitive; and alſo againſt the *fond opinion* of the Anabaptiſts and other Sectaries, accounting Sacraments to be chiefly profeſſing ſigns) may be evidenced by peruſing Biſhop *Cranmer* in his Preface to his book of the *Sacrament*, *Biſhop Ridley de Cœna Dom. p.* 28, 29. *Biſhop Jewel Apol. & Reply Art.* 8. Dr. *Whitaker de Sacr.* Qu. 1. *c.* 3. *Bucer. Conſ. de Euchar.* Sect. 45. & *Epiſt. ad Michael. N. Hiſpan. Kemnit. Exam. de Sacr.* Can. 5, 6, 7. *Urſini Apol. Catech.* ad 3^m^ Calumn. & adv. Anabapt. *Chamier de Sacram.* l. 1. c. 10. Sect. 13. *Rivet Cath. Orth.* Tr. 3. q. 1. with many others. Now none can appoint any ſuch ſign as this,

De Inſtit. Cler. l. 1. *c.* 24.

this, but he who hath power of *giving the Grace* exhited thereby: and if any humane authority conſtitute any ſign to this end and purpoſe, it would therefore be an *high intrenchment* upon the Soveraignty of God, and the authority of Chriſt; and the expecting this Grace from any ſuch ſign is *great ſuperſtition.*

10. Secondly, There are ſigns appointed, not to exhibit and tender the Grace of Gods Covenant, but to *teſtifie in Gods name* the certainty of ſome point of Faith, (as the *Star in the Eaſt* was a witneſs of Chriſts Birth, and an aſſurance thereof to the Wiſe men) or to *tender* ſome particular *ſpecial favour* or help from God, or to give aſſurance thereof in his name: and ſuch were the *Prieſtly Unctions* under the Law, and the *anointing of a King* by Gods *ſpecial Commandment*; the *brazen Serpent* in the Wilderneſs, and the ſign of *Gideons Fleece*, and the *ſhadow* going back on the Dial of *Ahaz.* And though theſe ſigns were not properly Sacraments, they were a kind of *Sacramentalia*, and upon the ſame account with the former ſort of ſigns, theſe could never be appointed by any power upon Earth.

11. Thirdly, There are ſome properly called *Myſtical teaching ſigns*; intended

tended to inform the underſtanding of man, concerning ſome myſtical or ſpiritual divine truth, by *Hieroglyphical* or viſible repreſentations. Thus in the Romiſh Church to *declare the death and reſurrection* of Chriſt, in a formal Proceſſion on *Good Friday*, the Hoſt is *laid in the Sepulchre*, and the Sepulchre *ſhut and ſealed*; but the Prieſt on *Eaſter day in the Morning*, with other of the Clergy *taketh the Hoſt* out of the Sepulchre, and leaveth it open: whither when the Clergy and people do come in a ſolemn Proceſſion and find the Sepulchre open, and the Hoſt not there; their Rector declareth *that Chriſt is riſen*, which they hear with joyfulneſs. But how manifeſt is it that this procedure, is more fitted to confirm the Jewiſh error, that his Diſciples came by night and *ſtole him away*, than to expreſs the glory of the divine power in raiſing Chriſt from the dead. And ſome as hath been declared by *Balſamon* have let *fly a Dove*, to repreſent the coming of the Holy Ghoſt, and *dreſſed a bed* to expreſs the ineffable Generation of Jeſus Chriſt: but theſe are ſuch *fond and fooliſh things*, that (beſides the great ſin of reſembling God by an Image) they are juſtly called by Biſhop *Taylor*, *Theatrical gayeties*; and ſuch things tend to *darken* and

Sacerdotalis Par. 3. de proceſſione in Paraſc & in die Paſch.

Balſ. in Conc. Trul. c. 82.

and *debaſe* the divine Myſteries, and to render Religion *contemptible*; by the ſordid lowneſs of ſuch repreſentations. Such things as theſe might juſtly be exploded by *Didoclavius*; but it is falſly inſinuated that herein he hath matter of *controverſie* with the Church of *England* (as if all ſignificant Rites were of a like nature) whereas it neither practiſeth nor approveth ſuch *irreligious vanity*. Spiritual Myſteries of Chriſtianity, can be fitly expreſſed by the *words of divine truth*, but the more ſpiritual they are in their own nature, the more they are *adulterated* and depraved by viſible *corporeal repreſentations*. *Altare Damaſc.*

12. Fourthly, Others are *profeſſing* and *ingaging ſigns*. Such ſigns whereby we viſibly profeſs the Chriſtian Faith, and Doctrine in general, cannot reaſonably be diſallowed, by them who acknowledge the *viſible profeſſion* of Chriſtianity to be a duty. And though ſuch a profeſſion is encluded in *receiving the Sacraments*, yet it is not ſo peculiar thereto, that it ſhould not be uſefully made in ſuch other outward actions; as the *liſting up* the hands or eyes, and *bowing* the knee to God in the name of Jeſus Chriſt, *ſtanding* at the Creed, particular *attendance* upon a Chriſtian Aſſembly, or (where the

ſtate of Religion requireth it) the yielding to be *Confeſſors* or *Martyrs* for Chriſtianity. Nor are ſuch external ſigns condemnable, whereby a profeſſion of ſome *particular doctrine* of Religion, is upon a weighty occaſion expreſſed; as the Rite uſed in an Oath, containeth an acknowledgment of the *righteouſneſs* and *Omniſciency* of God; the impoſition of hands frequently uſed of old towards Penitents, encluded a declaring, that Chriſt and the Goſpel Doctrine doth *graciouſly receive Sinners*, upon their hearty and unfeigned repentance; and to teſtifie the ſame, S. *John* the Apoſtle *kiſſed the hand* of that *Epheſian* Penitent, of whom we have an account in *Euſebius.* from *Clemens Alexandrinus.* And as outward actions are ordinarily fit, with many advantages to give evidence of the *mind and profeſſion* of men; ſo ſome Non-Conformiſts have accounted it a thing expedient, that thoſe who receive the Holy Sacrament, ſhould by their *ſubſcription* profeſs their reſolution, to believe and live as becometh the Goſpel: and the Author of the *Admonition* in the firſt edition thereof, did declare *ſitting* at the Lords Supper to be the more commendable, becauſe it *ſignified reſt*, and therefore might enclude a profeſſion of

Euſ. Hiſt. Eccl. l. 3. c. xy.

In Biſhop Whitgift Tr. 15. Ch. 1.

the

the *Ceremonial law being finiſhed*, and that a perfect work of redemption is wrought which *giveth reſt for ever*. Some profeſſing ſigns have principally expreſſed the *Communion of Chriſtians* amongſt themſelves, which muſt alſo be allowed lawful; ſuch were the *love Feaſts*, the *kiſs of Charity*; the ancient manner of Chriſtians owning one another as *brethren*, and receiving them as ſuch in their Houſes and diſmiſſing them with *peace*. And of this nature were the *Symbols* anciently given to the *Catechumens*, (which *Albaſpinus* very probably proveth, to be taken out of the *Oblations* of the Chriſtians) which encluded an acknowledgment, that they (though they were not yet *compleat Chriſtians*) had ſome *relation* to the Church of Chriſt, as a more full *right of Communion* was owned among the *Fideles* by the Feaſts of Charity. *Albaſ. Obſerv. l. 2. Obſ. 36.*

13. Other profeſſing ſigns do enclude ſome ſolemn *engagement* of perſons, either to undertake or to proſecute true Chriſtianity: this (if we charitably ſeparate it from other attendant miſtakes) is deſigned in the way of the Independent *Church Covenant*, and in the concluſory part of the Preſbyterian *League and Covenant*, and ſome perſons have done the like by ſome particular *writing* of their

own. All I ſhall ſay concerning theſe ſigns, is, that ſuch a ſerious engaging profeſſion can be no other way ſo *allowably* and *uſefully* performed, as in attendance upon and with reference unto the *Holy Sacraments*; becauſe they are Gods own *inſtitutions*; becauſe the proper and principal act and work of him who receiveth the Sacrament, is to *profeſs* his owning, and to *engage* himſelf unto the Faith, Hope, and practice of true Chriſtianity; and becauſe *divine grace* and fellowſhip with Chriſt, is alſo in the Goſpel Sacraments tendred unto us. And it is to the honour of the Church of *England*, that it appointeth no other way of *ſolemn engagement* to Chriſtianity, beſides the uſe of the two Sacraments of the New Teſtament, and *Confirmation*, which as it is an Apoſtolical Rite, ſo it containeth a *ratifying and confirming the baptiſmal vow, by perſons* come to ſome capacities of *underſtanding*; and therefore it is to be conſidered with reference unto Baptiſm, ſo far as concerneth the ſolemnity of *Engagement*.

14. Fifthly, There are *exciting ſigns*, which ſhould recal to our memories ſome profitable object or duty, and ſtir up our hearts and affections to a more ſerious practice of Religion. Such was *Joſhua's*

ſtone

ſtone ſet up, to be a witneſs or teſtimony of their profeſſion, leſt they ſhould deny their God, *Joſ.* 24. 26, 27. and the *trinal Merſion* in Baptiſm was to mind Chriſtians that their Baptiſm engaged them to *acknowledge* and *worſhip* the *Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghoſt.* And whereas it is objected againſt the uſe of any ſuch external ſigns, that this is to ſet up ſomething *to work Grace in the ſame manner that the Sacraments do, which do only objectively teach, remember, and excite; and thereby work on the underſtanding, will, memory, and affections:* all this is grounded upon manifeſt miſapprehenſions. For the holy Sacraments do not only *ſtir us up* to the exerciſe of Grace already received, but do *tender* to us a *Communion* with Chriſt, and a *Communication of further Grace from him*; which no humane Rites can do; Whence our Articles declare them to be *effectual ſigns of Grace and Gods good will towards us: by the which he doth work inviſibly in us, and doth not only quicken, but alſo ſtrengthen and confirm our Faith in him:* and agreeably hereunto is the Doctrine of all the Proteſtant Writers abovementioned. But to condemn all *objective incitements* to the exerciſe of Grace, as humane Sacraments; where there is no pretence of their being

Baxt. Diſp. of Ceremon. c. 2. Sect. 58.

Artic. 25.

In n. 9.

direct means of conveying further Grace from God; would enclude a cenſuring any particular becoming *actions*, *gravity*, and due expreſſion of *affectionateneſs* in the Miniſter or people in Chriſtian Aſſemblies, becauſe it is a means to excite others to the greater reverence, and Religious devotion; and would condemn any actions as *ſinful* and evil, meerly from their being *uſeful* to promote good. And for example, hereupon he who looking into a *Regiſter Book*, where his Baptiſm is recorded, ſhall only take notice of his Age ſhould be commended: But he who upon the ſight of his name in that Book, is put in memory concerning his *Baptiſmal Covenant* and excited to a care of anſwering that Covenant, by a Chriſtian and pious life, ſhould be guilty of *grievous* ſin, as if this was to make that Book to be a kind of Sacrament. And they who reject all exciting ſigns as being *Sacramental*, may find almoſt all the ſame pretences to diſlike all *words* not inſtituted of God, which do *excite men* to Religious Piety; eſpecially when they are accompanied with any outward action though it be but a geſture: becauſe not only *Sacramental ſigns* but *Sacramental words* in their Sacramental Uſe, as in Baptiſm, *I baptize thee in the name, &c.* do both

both *exhibit* and *excite* Grace as an *eſſential* part of that Sacrament; and there is not much more reaſon to conclude all *exciting ſigns* to be Sacramental ſigns, than to account all *exciting words* to be Sacramental words.

15. Sixthly, Other external things in Gods worſhip are properly ſignificant *of reverence* towards him, and of *high eſteem* of him, and his Ordinances. Such are a humble and devout behaviour and geſture, which are Hypocritical actions, where no ſuch ſignification is intended; but when deſigned to this end, they are *truly religious*, but far from being Sacramental. Of this nature are the preparing and preſerving *decent ſtructures*, and other things comely (as Communion Table, Cup, *&c.*) which are ſet apart for Religious ſervice. And to this ſixth head, belongeth the uſe of the *Miniſterial Garments* appointed in our Church, as the uſe of the *Croſs* in the Office of Baptiſm, is of the nature of a memorative and exciting ſign, under the former head. And to diſlike theſe things ſolely becauſe of ſuch *ſignification*, is to account the actions of man (who in Gods worſhip acts as a reaſonable Creature) to be the worſe meerly becauſe he is able to give a *good and rational account* why he doth perform them.

SECT. II.

Of Eccleſiaſtical appointments, conſidered as impoſed, and enjoined.

1. Having proved in the former Chapter the *lawfulneſs* of ſome external Rites, and having ſhewed in this Chapter that they do not become *unlawful* by being *ſignificant*, we may hence infer, that nothing can be ſaid againſt the enjoining ſome ſuch lawful Rites but what will equally oppoſe all *Eccleſiaſtical Injunctions* and Conſtitutions in things indifferent. For if theſe things be in themſelves both *lawful* and in their due *circumſtances uſeful*, (as I have above ſhewed) and if there be a *power* in the Church of enjoining lawful things to uſeful purpoſes, then cannot the eſtabliſhing theſe things thus directed be diſallowed. But to deny the lawfulneſs of *Eccleſiaſtical Sanctions* and Conſtitutions is to charge all the ancient famous known parts of the Church of Chriſt, with a ſinful *uſurpation* of authority in the Church: for that they enjoined what they judged uſeful, both in *General* and *Provincial Synods*, is manifeſt from the Canons of the *Code* of the Univerſal Church, and of the Roman and African

African Churches; and from the more ancient *Canons* among thoſe called the Apoſtles, and from other Eccleſiaſtical *Rules of Diſcipline* frequently mentioned in *Tertullian*, S. *Cyprian* and other ancient Writers. And that this practice of the Church was uſed ever ſince the Apoſtles, is not only manifeſt from the inſtances given in the former Chapter; but *Sect.* 3. is alſo evident from the *Synod at Jeruſalem* and its deciſions concerning ſome things indifferent mentioned, *Act.* 15.

2. Concerning the Decrees of that Council at *Jeruſalem*, I ſhall Obſerve, 1. That ſome part of the matter of them, was not contained under the Divine Precepts of *perpetual obligation*, but was enjoined only as *Eccleſiaſtical laws* of mutable Conſtitution. I ſhould willingly acknowledge, that not only that part of the Apoſtolical Decree, which concerned *Fornication*, but that alſo which concerned *things offered unto Idols*, did contain an immutable Law to all Chriſtians, and that what S. *Paul* writeth upon this ſubject, in his firſt Epiſtle to the *Corinthians*, did not at all *invalidate* or *diſpenſe* with the Decree of the Apoſtolical Synod (as divers worthy men have judged) but only declareth how far that Decree *intended to oblige*. That which renders

ders this opinion probable, is becauſe it is evident by comparing *Act.* 15. 20. with *Act.* 15. 29. that the Apoſtles in commanding to *abſtain from meats offered to Idols*, deſigned only to prohibit the ἀλισγήματα τῶν εἰδώλων *pollutions of Idols*; and becauſe after the writing the Epiſtles to the *Corinthians*, it was ſtill in as general terms as that Synod did expreſs it, accounted a duty to abſtain from the εἰδωλόθυτα, or *things ſacrificed to Idols*; not only by divers particular ancient Writers, but by one of the Canons of the Greek Code, and even by S. *John* in the *Revelations Rev.* 2. 14. But that that Decree concerning *things ſtrangled* and *bloud*, was no perpetually binding Law of God, may be evinced from the general *judgment* of the Church of God, which doth not now account it binding; (ſome very few perſons excepted) from ſuch general expreſſions of holy Scripture as that *nothing is unclean in it ſelf*, and *to the pure all things are pure*; and from the Apoſtles expreſſing their decree to be a *laying a burden* upon the Churches, *Act.* 15. 28. Wherefore when the whole matter of this Decree, is in that verſe called *neceſſary things*; we muſt thereby underſtand, that ſome things indifferent, yea under the Goſpel *inconvenient* in their own nature,

Conc. Gangr. Can. 21

Aug. cont. Fauſt. l. 32. c. 13. Binium in 4. Syn. Apoſt. de Immolatis.

ture, being judged of uſe for the avoiding *ſcandal*, and promoting *Peace and Unity* in the Church, became *neceſſary to be practiſed* in the Church, after that Decree and Injunction. And though the end of deſigning the Unity and encreaſe of the Church, did require, that in ſome things the *Gentile Chriſtians* ſhould yield a *compliance* to the Jews; yet in what particulars this compliance ſhould conſiſt, was *determined* by the authority of this Apoſtolical Synod, whereby the practice thereof became neceſſary.

3. *Obſ.* 2. That Apoſtolical Decree concerning theſe matters indifferent, was deſigned to lay an *obligation* upon the practice of all *Gentile Chriſtians* in thoſe Apoſtolical times. There are indeed ſome very learned men who have reputed this Decree to be a *local conſtitution*, confined to *Syria*, *Cilicia* and the Territories of *Antioch and Jeruſalem*. And if it had extended no further, it had been a ſufficient inſtance of an Injunction in things indifferent; but if it was intended to oblige all the Gentiles, it is thereupon to be eſteemed a more *full and large example*. Now that this Decree contained in the firſt Canonical and Apoſtolical Epiſtle of the New Teſtament, was of *general concernment* to the Gentile Chriſtians,

ſtians, though its inſcription referred to thoſe places above mentioned, may be concluded, becauſe S. *James* declared it in general to have reſpect to the *believing Gentiles*, *Act.* 21. 25. becauſe S. *Paul*, *Silas*, and *Timothens delivered this Decree* even unto the Cities of *Lycaonia*, *Phrygia*, and *Galatia*, to be *obſerved* by them, *Act.* 16. 1, 3, 4, 6. and becauſe the Primitive Chriſtians did in all places, account themſelves bound by this determination of the Apoſtles, *to abſtain from blond, and things ſtrangled*, as appeareth from the teſtimonies of *Tertullian*, *Minucius Felix*, *Origen*, the *Epiſtle from France*, concerning their Martyrs recorded in *Euſebius*, and the Canon of the Greek Code above mentioned.

Tertul. Apol. c. 9. Minut. in Oct. Orig. cont. Celſ. l. 8. Euſ. Hiſt. Eccl. l. 5. c. 1.

4. *Obſ.* 3. It is acknowledged upon good grounds (and granted by the Preſbyterians,) that this Apoſtolical Sanction doth evidence a *power* in the Church, of *enjoining* in lawful things, what may be conducible to the good and welfare of the Church; both becauſe the *ſucceſſive practice* of the Church did thenceforward exerciſe ſuch a power; and becauſe (though the Apoſtles might be *inſpired extraordinarily* after they met together in this Synod,) yet they did not account a particular divine inſpiration, neceſſary to make

make an *Eccleſiaſtical Conſtitution*; but in that great queſtion whether and how far the Gentiles ſhould undertake the Law of *Moſes* they came together to *conſider of this matter*, *Act.* 15. 5, 6. and proceeded therein by way of *diſputation*, *v.* 7. Hence *Gilleſpy* in his aſſertion of the Government of the Church of *Scotland*, concludeth the *Authority* of Synodical Aſſemblies, and that they have a *diatactick power* to make Decrees. The *London* Miniſters in their *Jus Divinum Regiminis Eccleſiaſtici*, declare this Apoſtolical Synod to be a *pattern* and *platform* for others, and thence allow a *Synodical power of impoſing things on the Church*, which they aſſert to be encluded in the *Antithesis*, *Act.* 15. 28. And the *Aſſemblies Confeſſion* doth from hence aſſert a power in Synods, *to make Decrees and determinations, which ought to be received with reverence, as from Gods Ordinance; and to ſet down rules and directions, for the better ordering the publick worſhip of God.* Yet it may be obſerved, that ſome of that way have in this particular manifeſted great partiality: as Mr. *Rutherford*, when he diſputes againſt our Church, and againſt the lawfulneſs of external Rites, he denyeth any power in the Church, *to preſcribe Laws touching things indifferent*:

Gilleſp. Par. 2. Ch. 4. & Ch. 8.

Part 2. c. 14.

Conf. c. 31.

Ruth. Introd. to Div. Right of Ch Gov. Sect. 5. p. 81. Diſp. of Scandal & Liberty qu. 5.

indifferent: but in his Plea for Preſbytery, he aſſerteth their Synods, to have power to *make Eccleſiaſtical Canons and Decrees, which tye and bind particular Congregations to obſerve and obey them.*

Plea for Presbyt. Ch. 14. p. 199.

5. Wherefore if the Apoſtles did *make injunctions* concerning things indifferent, and *impoſed* them upon all the Churches of the Gentiles, and accounted their authority of Eccleſiaſtical Government, guided by *prudential conſideration*, to be ſufficient without extraordinary inſpiration, to eſtabliſh ſuch a Sanction: then muſt this *power* remain in the Church, (taking in the Princes ſupremacy) where the Authority of *Church Government* abideth permanent.

6. And if we conſider the Church under the General Notion of a *Society*; as it is ordinary in all Societies, for the Rulers thereof to exerciſe a power of making *Rules and Conſtitutions*, not contradictory to any ſuperiour Government, for *preſerving a due order* in that Society; ſo this doth eſpecially take place in the Chriſtian Church, where there are ſpecial divine Laws, which require care to be taken for *order and decency*, and command Chriſtians to *obey them who have the rule over them.* And that thoſe who will enjoy the Communion of any particular

cular Church, muſt *ſubmit* to the Rules of order appointed therein, is but the proper reſult of *orderly Conſtitution*, and is of general practice; inſomuch that the French Reformed Churches, as hath been obſerved by Mr. *Durell*, would not ſuffer Mr. *Welch* who came thither from *Scotland*, to continue in adminiſtring the Sacrament, without *uſing the preſcribed form of Prayer*, and admitting the *ſtanding geſture*, according to the order of that Church, but he being enjoined Conformity by the Synod at S. *Maixant*, 1609. left that Church and Realm rather than he would embrace it.

Durelli Vindic. Eccl. Angl. c. 22. & in Præf.

7. But it is by ſome pleaded againſt the lawfulneſs of Conſtitutions Eccleſiaſtical, that theſe are an *infringing of Chriſtian Liberty*. But whereas Eccleſiaſtical Rites and Conſtitutions are in themſelves lawful, as hath been proved; prudential determinations about ſuch indifferent things, can no more *incroach* upon Chriſtian liberty, than do the political Sanctions of Civil Laws, and the Domeſtick commands of Parents and Maſters. And ſurely every mans apprehenſion muſt needs acknowledge it a groſs miſtake to imagine, that when the Precepts of Chriſtianity do earneſtly enjoin the practice of *ſelf-denial, meekneſs, ſubmiſſion,*

ſubmiſſion, and obedience to ſuperiours, it ſhould be the priviledge of Chriſtian liberty to *diſoblige* men from any of theſe things, which would repreſent our moſt excellent Religion as contradicting it ſelf. But true Chriſtian liberty conveyeth a priviledge of *freedom*, from that which the Chriſtian Doctrine *aboliſheth*, (the *Maſaical* Covenant and Ceremonies of the Law) from that which its Precepts *prohibit* and *diſclaim*, (the life of ſin, and bondage to the Devil, and being under any other as our Soveraign and ſupreme Lord beſides Jeſus Chriſt) and from that, from which its promiſes tend to *ſecure* us, (the curſe, and wrath to come, and thereby from Hell and Death.) But it was S. *Peters* Doctrine, that we ſhould *obey every Ordinance of man for the Lords ſake*, -- *as free*, 1 *Pet.* 2. 13. -- 16. and it was truly expreſſed in the Aſſemblies Confeſſion, *That they who upon pretence of Chriſtian Liberty, ſhall oppoſe any lawful power, or the lawful exerciſe of it, whether it be Civil or Eccleſiaſtical, reſiſt the Ordinance of God.* And as for thoſe ſtrange ſpirited men, who account the practiſing things *indifferent to be the worſe*, becauſe they are *enjoined*; they are guided by ſuch dangerous Principles, of falſe imaginary Liberty, as would teach Children and Servants

Conf. Ch. 20. Sect. 4.

vants that things otherwiſe *lawful* are *ſinfully performed*, when they are *commanded* by their Parents and Maſters.

8. But Mr. *Rutherford* objecteth that the nature of things *indifferent* are not capable of being *enjoined* by a Law. For (ſaith he) *what wiſe man will ſay, the Church may make a law that all men ſhould caſt ſtones into the water*, or (as he in another place inſtanceth) *that a man ſhould rub his beard?* Whether theſe and other ſuch like words, proceeded from groſs miſtake of the *Queſtion* about things *Indifferent*, or from wilful miſrepreſentation thereof, to pleaſe the humours of *ſcornful men*, I cannot affirm. For things called *Indifferent* in this Queſtion, are not ſuch as *can tend to no good*, but are a miſpending time, when purpoſely undertaken as a deſigned buſineſs; and enclude alſo ſuch a levity and vanity as is inconſiſtent with gravity and ſeriouſneſs, and much more with Religious Devotion. But the things here called matters indifferent are ſuch, where many things ſingly taken are in their *general nature uſeful*, but becauſe no one of them is particularly eſtabliſhed by any Divine Law, the appointing any one in *particular* is called the determination of a thing Indifferent, becauſe ſome other might have been *law-*

Ruth. Introd. to Doctr. of Scandal.

 Of Eccleſiaſtical appointments as ſignificant, fully appointed. Thus the uſe of one ſpecial *form of Prayer* preſcribed, not condemning all others as unlawful, is the uſe of an indifferent thing to an uſeful end. And the ordering ſome *proper Hymns* or Pſalms of Praiſe for the glorifying God, and decent geſtures of reverence in Gods ſervice; and the appointing a *fit tranſlation of the Bible* for publick uſe, and a *particular viſible ſign* of Chriſtian profeſſion, are things of good uſe, but are called Indifferent, becauſe theſe particular things are not ſo eſtabliſhed by Divine Precepts, but that ſome other Prayers, Hymns, Geſtures, Tranſlation, or token of profeſſion, might have been (without ſin and breach of any particular divine commands) choſen and *appointed* in the Church: and the like may be ſaid of other things. So that ſuch things as theſe which may manifeſtly have a *profitable uſe*, where they are obſerved without miſunderſtanding and prejudice, but are no ſpecial matters enjoined by any Divine Laws immediately given from God himſelf, are the moſt proper and moſt accountable matter for *Eccleſiaſtical Laws and Conſtitutions*, and are fit to be ordered by thoſe who are inveſted with Power and Authority; eſpecially when the particular things ſo eſtabliſhed, may be peculiarly

peculiarly recommended upon good conſiderations, of *Antiquity or manifeſt uſefulneſs.*

9. But ſome have further Queſtioned, whether things concerning the Church and the order thereof, may be *eſtabliſhed by Secular Sanctions*, the tranſgreſſion of which is attended with *civil penalties*? This Authority hath been exerciſed by the moſt *Religious Kings and Rulers of Iſrael* and *Judah* in the Old Teſtament, who were therefore commended in the Holy Scriptures; and alſo by the *Chriſtian Emperours* as appears by their Laws in the *Codex* and *Novellæ*; and by divers *Kings* of our own and Foreign Nations in former times; it is acknowledged by the *Articles of our Church*, and by the *Doctrine and practice* of the ancient Church; is eſtabliſhed by our *Laws*, and hath been defended by divers good Writers concerning the *Kings Supremacy in cauſes Eccleſiaſtical.* But ſome there are both at home and abroad, joining herein with the *Spirit* of the *Anabaptiſts*, who have undertaken to deny the lawfulneſs of any ſuch proceedings, under pretence of *advancing Chriſtianity* thereby and of pleading for *due liberty* in matters of Religion: but their grounds and reaſons on which they build, are not ſtrong enough to bear the weight they lay upon them. *Article 37.*

10. For they who tell us, that the uſe of ſuch *civil Laws* and penalties, tendeth to declare, that the motives and *arguments* of the Goſpel are *weak*, and inſufficient to recommend the Chriſtian truth, and preſerve the order of the Church, without the help of the ſecular power; do ſeem not to conſider that *Treaſons, Murders, Adulteries, Theſts, and Perjuries*, with other great crimes, are vehemently prohibited by the Precepts of Chriſt, and yet are upon good grounds puniſhed by the *power of the Sword*, which is alſo Gods Authority; not becauſe of any *inſufficiency* of the arguments propounded by the Doctrine of Chriſt, but becauſe the corruptneſs of many mens Spirits is ſuch, that divers perſons are prone to overlook the moſt *weighty motives and arguments*, which are of an Heavenly and ſpiritual nature, when they are more affected with *ſenſible* things of much leſs concernment.

11. And as for them who ſay that all *temporal laws and penalties* about Church matters, will never make men *truly Religious*, but may make them *Hypocrites*, and cauſe them to profeſs and practiſe what they do not heartily approve; this is manifeſtly *untrue*; for though I grant that theſe means have ſometimes accidentally

dentally this *ill effect* upon ſome men, yet even Laws and Penalties rightly diſpenſed, are a proper and effectual means in themſelves to make men ſeriouſly and *rightly Religious.* This effect, as S. *Auguſtine upon his own knowledge* declareth, they obtained both in his *own Church*, and divers other *African Churches*, where many of the Donatiſts from thence took occaſion, ſeriouſly to conſider and embrace the truth, and rejoiced that by this means they were brought to the *right knowledge* thereof. And thus all *well-ordered Government* in a Realm or Family, the *encouraging* what is good, and the *diſcountenancing* errours, prophaneneſs, and all diſorders, by great men or others, may have this accidental ill conſequence upon ſome men, that it may occcaſion them *hypocritically to pretend* to be better than they are, out of affectation of applauſe, and deſigns of advantage: yet theſe things being *duties*, (as the Magiſtrates care to promote Religion is alſo) they ought not to be *neglected*, becauſe they may poſſibly be *abuſed.* *Aug. Ep.* 48.

12. And whereas ſome urge, that in the *Apoſtolical times* which were the beſt, there were no *ſecular Sanctions* or outward penalties uſed in matters of Religion: they might alſo have obſerved,

that Kings and Emperours were then no *countenancers, favourers*, nor yet *Profeſſors* of Chriſtianity; which is not to be a pattern for the ſucceeding times, when it muſt be eſteemed a *bleſſing* to the Church, to have *Kings her nurſing Fathers*, and a *duty* to all Rulers upon earth to acknowledge their ſubjection to Jeſus Chriſt. And yet even in the Apoſtles times, there were *corporal puniſhments miraculouſly inflicted*, to awaken men to mind the practice and careful exerciſe of Chriſtianity, not only in the particular inſtances of *Saul* going to *Damaſcus*, of *Ananias* and *Sapphira*, and of *Elymas*: but the *delivering a perſon to Satan* hath been ordinarily obſerved to enclude with the ſentence of the Church, a giving him over to ſome outward bodily calamities, to be inflicted on him by the *evil ſpirit*, of which a particular inſtance is given concerning the Servant of *Stilico*, by *Paulinus*, in the life of S. *Ambroſe*.

Paulin. in Vit. Ambr. prope fin.

13. But that this Queſtion may be reſolved, we muſt note, 1. That it concerneth only *ſecular authority* when it is *rightly informed* in theſe matters of Religion about which ſuch Laws are *eſtabliſhed*. For according to the Rules of Conſcience, as no authority upon earth may lawfully *countenance* or *join* in the profeſſion

profeſſion of an errour, ſo neither may it by commands, conſtitutions or penalties, deſign to advance it. But it is as unreaſonable, that the uſe of *ſecular authority* to *advance* what is good and commendable, ſhould hence be commended, as that the holy action of *Abraham*, *Gen.* 18. 19. *commanding his Children to keep the way of the Lord*, ſhould be diſliked, becauſe it is certainly unlawful for any Parents to *command* and *enjoin* their Children, to entertain ſin and embrace errour. For it is every mans duty to cloſe with that which is good, and to *favour* and prefer it, but it is his ſin to oppoſe it, or to make uſe of his intereſt in the behalf of that which is *evil*. 2. Nor is this Queſtion about the lawfulneſs of *deſigning* the *ruine* and *deſtruction* of any perſon, only becauſe they err in matters of Religion, which is a thing by no means allowable: and not only the uſe of *Fire* and *Faggot* for pretended *Hereſie*, but the inflicting *capital puniſhments* for the ſole crimes even of *real Hereſie*, or *notorious errours in Religion*, have been ſufficiently diſclaimed by the great defenders of our Political and Eccleſiaſtical Conſtitutions.

Biſhop Whitgifts Defence of his Ex. to Magiſt. in fin.

Biſhop Bilſon of Chriſtian Subjection Par. 1. p. 19.

14. 3. To eſtabliſh ſuch Laws backed with *penalties*, about good and uſeful

matters *Eccleſiaſtical*, which may be a proper and fit motive (reſpect being had by the prudence of Superiours, to the nature of the things enjoined, and to the temper of the perſons to be dealt with) to *excite* men to conſider and mind their duty, is not only *allowable*, but it is the natural reſult of Rulers *diſcountenancing* evil, deſigning their Subjects *good*, being careful of the *Churches welfare*, and of *ſerving God* in the uſe of their authority; and is contained under that Apoſtolical Rule, *Rom.* 13. 4. *If thou do that which is evil, be afraid of the power.* But if any ſhall contend, that outward puniſhments are no way uſeful, to direct mens minds to a ſenſe of their duty, he muſt contradict the common *experience* of a conſiderable part of Mankind, and muſt diſclaim any advantage for amendment of life from *paternal correction*, the *conſtitution of Magiſtracy* and divers providential *chaſtiſements* of God againſt the frequent expreſſions of holy Scripture. And he muſt alſo undertake to aſſert, that the condition of *Iſrael* was not better when all the people engaged themſelves to the ſervice of God, moved by the *zeal* for true Religion in their Kings, attended with their *denouncing temporal puniſhments* on them who neglected

lected or refuſed, than when every one deſignedly and profeſſedly walked in the ways of his own heart.

15. And whereas ſeveral expreſſions in ancient Writers ſpeak againſt the *uſe of external force* in matters of Religion: divers of them are intended againſt the *Pagan or Heretical powers* oppreſſing the truth; others againſt *over-rigorous ſeverities* and extremities towards ſome perſons under errour; ſome were the expreſſions of thoſe who were themſelves abetters of *Schiſm*, as *Socrates* was; and there are ſome few expreſſions of others who were men *of greater affection than conſideration*, whoſe words may be over-balanced both by reaſon and other Authorities.

SECT. III.

Of Eccleſiaſtical Conſtitutions about things ſcrupled.

1. That ſuch things which ſome perſons *ſcruple, oppoſe, and diſpute againſt*, may be practiſed without ſin, by them who diſcern and are well ſatisfied of their lawfulneſs, is a thing that needeth not much proof. For if this be denied, Chriſtianity muſt be accounted a *ſtate of bondage*,

bondage, where every mans miſtaken apprehenſions would lay an obligation on the Conſciences of others. Wherefore in that Caſe, when ſome Chriſtians judged it unlawful to eat all ſorts of meat, S. *Paul* allowed him who *diſcerned his liberty* to make uſe thereof, *Rom.* 14. 2, 6. Yet becauſe both in that Chapter of the Epiſtle to the *Romans*, and in 1 *Cor.* 10. he giveth command to Chriſtians to beware of *grieving and offending their brethren*, the general caſe of *Scandal* in things indifferent, will in this place come under ſome conſideration, concerning which it may be ſufficient to obſerve three things.

2. Firſt, That the offending others prohibited in thoſe places by the Apoſtle, conſiſted not *in diſpleaſing* others only, but in performing ſuch actions which tended to *occaſion ſome to fall from Chriſtianity*, or others not to embrace it. This ſenſe of theſe Precepts, is obſerved as a thing manifeſt by Mr. *Thorndike*. Thus S. *Paul* declareth the uſing liberty about things offered to Idols, ſo as to be *a ſtumbling block to the weak*, 1 *Cor.* 8. 9. to conſiſt in *emboldning them towards the Idol*, *v.* 10. *whereby the weak Brother periſheth*, *v.* 11. And though the Apoſtle ſometimes mentioneth this ſin of offending others,

Right of the Church c. 4.

others, under the name of *grieving them*, *Rom.* 14. 15. he thereby intendeth an occaſioning them to *diſguſt the Chriſtian Religion*; and therefore in the ſame verſe commandeth, *Deſtroy not him with thy meat &c.* And when he recommendeth in this Caſe the *pleaſing of others*, it is in deſigning their *profit that they may be ſaved*, 1 *Cor.* 10. 33. Yet it muſt be further acknowledged, that according to the expreſſions of other Scriptures, it is a *ſinful ſcandal* or giving offence, when any one by the uſe of his liberty, doth *knowingly induce* others to the committing any ſin, being under no obligation to determine this uſe of his liberty: for according to S. *Hierome* that is *ſcandal where a man dicto vel facto occaſionem ruinæ cuiquam dederit.* *Hier. in Mat. 15. v. 12.*

3. But the meer *diſpleaſing or grieving* others about matters indifferent, is not always a ſin; for our Saviour himſelf *greatly grieved* his Apoſtles, when he told them that one of them ſhould betray him, but as yet concealed the man, *Mat.* 26. 21, 22. Yet Chriſtianity will not allow a *moroſe and peeviſh* temper; but directeth men to be loving, amicable, and kind, and to be ready to pleaſe others, where *duty or prudence* do not otherwiſe engage us: but out of complyance to the

the mind of others, to neglect due *reverence* to God, or Rules of *order* in the Church of God, is not allowable. And there lieth a much *higher obligation* upon us to *pleaſe* others, where we are engaged thereto by the bond of *juſtice, ſubjection and obedience*, than where we are only enclined thereto by the influence of *love and common kindneſs*; whence the Child or Servant who will provoke his Father or Maſter, by acts of diſobedience contrary to his duty, meerly to pleaſe other perſons, acted irregularly and ſinfully; and upon the ſame account, he who will *diſpleaſe and diſobey* his Rulers and Governours, whether Civil or Eccleſiaſtical, to gratifie other perſons of inferiour capacity, acteth contrary to Chriſtian duty.

4. Secondly, the *Plea of Scandal* muſt then neceſſarily be ill uſed, when what is undertaken under pretence of avoiding offence, doth it ſelf become the *greater offence*. In the Caſe mentioned in the Epiſtles to the *Romans* and the *Corinthians* there was no giving offence to the *Jews, Gentiles, or the Church of God*, by their preſent forbearance of any ſort of meat, under the circumſtances in which they then were; and therefore this forbearance out of charity to others became

became a duty. But when S. *Peter* and *Barnabas* at *Antioch*, did for a time *forbear to eat with the Gentiles*, which ſeemingly encluded an *unjuſt cenſure* of the way of Chriſtianity, as it was embraced among the *Gentiles*: and was like to be a *great offence* to the *Gentiles*; this action though undertaken out of an appearance of *charitable reſpect* to the Jews, that they might not be offended, was ſinful and contrary to the Goſpel. And upon the like account the diſobeying *Eccleſiaſtical Conſtitutions*, out of reſpect to ſome other perſons, while it encludeth an appearance of ungrounded *cenſuring* of our *Rulers* who appointed them, and the *Church* who practiſeth them, and a want of *care* of its order, Peace, and Unity, beſides other ill conſequents above expreſſed is not allowable, nor can it be juſtified by the rules of Religion, but by the bad example of neglect of duty it giveth the greateſt *occaſion of offence*.

5. And if any perſons ſhall in ſuch a caſe take offence ſo far as to *diſtaſt the Religious worſhip of God*, becauſe others obſerve eſtabliſhed Orders, this is an offence *taken* but not *given*. For in matters indifferent and left altogether to our liberty, he who without any care of his Brothers good, acteth what he knoweth

V. Tertullian. de Virgin. vel. c. 3.

eth will occaſion him to fall, is guilty of a ſcandal, againſt the *Rule of Charity*; but he who acteth nothing but what is his duty, lawfully *commanded* by his Superiour, or undertaken with reſpect to the greater *good and order* of the Church, is guilty of no *ſcandal* nor *breach of Charity*, though others may take occaſion to fall thereby. It is well reſolved by *Aquinas*, that every *ſcandal* or offence encludeth *ſin*; that which is a *ſcandal given or an active ſcandal is the ſin of him who giveth the occaſion*; *but the ſcandal taken or the paſſive ſcandal is the ſin of him only who taketh the occaſion to fall.* Thus there were divers things which our Saviour ſpake and did, at which the Phariſees were *offended*, the ſin of which muſt be charged upon themſelves, in being alienated thereby from the Doctrine of Chriſt.

22 *q.* 43. *Art.* 2.

6. Thirdly, The duty of *forbearing* the uſe of ſome things lawful and expedient, becauſe others account them ſinful, hath likewiſe peculiar reſpect to that caſe when the erring perſons have not had *ſufficient opportunity of being fully inſtructed*, and ſtedfaſtly *eſtabliſhed* in the truth. Thus in the time of the Apoſtles when the Doctrine of the Goſpel was firſt divulged, the Jews could not be preſently

ſently ſatisfied concerning the *liberty* and freedom of Chriſtians from the *rites of the law of Moſes*; and many of the Gentiles were not ſo firmly *eſtabliſhed* in all the Doctrines of Chriſtianity, that they might not be led aſide by miſtaking the practices of other Chriſtians: and in ſuch caſes the uſe of *things lawful and indifferent*, muſt be reſtrained from the conſideration of others *weakneſs*. But where there hath been ſufficient means and opportunity for better inſtruction; if ſome ſtill retain their *erroneous opinions*, they who underſtand the truth are not obliged in this caſe, to forbear their practiſing according to their *true principles*, in matters of *indifferency* and *Chriſtian liberty*: becauſe this practice is in this caſe a *profeſſion of truth* againſt errour, and the forbearance thereof may frequently be interpreted a *complyance* with errour. *Urſin Loc. Theol. in 3^m. Prac.* And it is truly obſerved by *Urſin* that it is *ſcandalum datum in rebus adiaphoris errores in animis infirmorum confirmare, to add confirmation to erroneous opinions in the minds of the weak about indifferent things, is a giving offence*, or being guilty of an *active ſcandal*. Upon this account though our Saviour knew that his *healing*, and *commanding* the man who was healed to *take up his bed on the ſabbath day*, his eating

eating with *Publicans and Sinners*, and his Diſciples eating with *unwaſhen hands*, were things in the higheſt manner *offenſive* to ſome of the Jews; he practiſed and allowed theſe things in oppoſition to the Scribes and Phariſees, who in their cenſures of him proceeded upon erroneous and *corrupt Doctrines* vented by them for *divine dictates*.

7. But it may deſerve a more *full enquiry*, whether Eccleſiaſtical *Conſtitutions* and legal *Injunctions*, may be allowed concerning things which either are or may become *matter of diſpute* and *oppoſition?* becauſe this is a thing which is in the ſubſtance of it much inſiſted upon. In order to the reſolution hereof I ſhall aſſert, 1. The *Peace and Unity* of a Church (which muſt both reſpect the Union of its members among themſelves, and with the *Univerſal Church*) is of ſo great value, that to that end, it would be very deſirable that any *particular conſtitution* about matters meerly indifferent ſhould be *altered*, where peace with a *well ordered ſtate* of the Church can only by that means be firmly ſecured: becauſe the principal end of them is to promote Unity, order and edification.

Commiſ. Papers paſſim.

8. *Aſſert.* 2. Where minds are prone to *raiſe diſputes*, and entertain *prejudices* and

and *jealouſies* about matters of Gods worſhip; the moſt innocent things cannot be long ſecured, from being *oppoſed and ſcrupled*. For in this caſe when men of greater parts do without juſt cauſe propound *doubts* and arguments againſt a thing, (which may eaſily be done about any ſubject) men of leſſer underſtanding, if they have alſo *unſetled* and *uneſtabliſhed minds*, are apt either out of *weakneſs of judgment*, to take their fallacies to be ſolid reaſons; or from the *earneſtneſs* of their *affections*, to eſteem ſuch perſons to be the ableſt and faithfulleſt guides. And he who obſerveth the World, will diſcern that there is ſcarce any truth of Religion even in matters moſt *fundamental*, which hath not been diſputed and oppoſed by men of corrupt minds, who have by this means *drawn Diſciples* after them. For beſides the conſideration of *Papiſts* and other Sectaries abroad, where multitudes of their followers have really *believed* their errors, and with a *miſguided zeal* oppoſed the truth, as S. *Paul* did while he continued in Judaiſm: we have alſo ſufficient evidence hereof at home in our former times of *licentiouſneſs*. Inſomuch that Mr. *Baxter* then complained, that *profeſſors of Religion did oppoſe & deride, almoſt all that worſhip of God, out of Con-* *Saints Reſt Part.* 1. *Ch.* 7. *Sect.* 14.

ſcience (which muſt then be grolly depraved and corrupted) *which others did out of prophaneneſs.* And the provincial Aſſembly (as it was called) at *London*, then declared, *That there was ſcarce any truth of Chriſt but was charged in thoſe unhappy times*, (ſo they called them) *as Antichriſtian*; and that *the Doctrine of the Trinity, of Chriſt being equal with the Father, of the immortality of the Soul, of repentance, humiliation, ſanctification, and good works out of obedience to Gods commands*, with other Doctrines were condemned *as Antichriſtian*: and alſo that *the places where they met together to worſhip God, the worſhip they there performed, their Church Government and Miniſtry was alſo* (ſay they) *called Antichriſtian.* Now if (among other things oppoſed and condemned) the moſt *eſſential Doctrines of Chriſtian Religion* have not eſcaped theſe vehement and unjuſt cenſures; it cannot be expected that the *beſt Conſtitutions of the Church* ſhould be generally entertained, without all *ſcruple* and *ſuſpicion*; eſpecially ſo long as through the itch of diſpute, things ordered in the Church are thought blameable for being *ſignificant*, that is *uſeful*; (for all inſignificant things are here uſeleſs) and for being *enjoined*, that is *recommended* by the higheſt

Jus div. Min. Evangel. Par. 2. c. 3.

higheſt authority which God hath ſet in and over his Church.

9. *Aſſert.* 3. As all Eccleſiaſtical Conſtitutions muſt be in themſelves *certainly lawful*, not needleſly burdenſom, and ſuch as the Governours of the Church judge to be unqueſtionably *uſeful and expedient*; ſo where they are ſuch, their lawfulneſs would not be ſo much *contended againſt*, as it is, by them who are concerned to obey, provided they humbly and calmly made uſe of the *beſt rules* to direct their own practice: which rules are here the ſame, which muſt be received in other practical controverſies of Religion. *viz.* Firſt, That he who hath ſufficient capacity of underſtanding, to *judge clearly and ſolidly* of the things queſtioned, and of the ſtrength of the arguments produced, ſhould without any prejudice or paſſion, embrace and entertain what appeareth manifeſtly allowable: and ſuch an underſtanding ſo proceeding, can neither *condemn* the right way, nor *embrace* the wrong, becauſe truth only can be clearly evidenced, to an unbyaſſed and able judgment; and for ſuch a man to *follow any authority whatſoever*, againſt this manifeſt evidence of truth, is to put himſelf under the blind Leaders of the blind. Secondly, Men

ought to be ſo *humble*, as not to account their own judgments *ſufficient* rationally to *decide* any matters of diſpute, or *determine* the force of any argument, when they really are not; and this will direct men of mean capacities, not overforwardly to engage in controverſies above their reach: nor violently to *eſpouſe* what may be wrong, or oppoſe what may be right, but humbly to deſire and ſeek for clearer apprehenſions, or the beſt directions and informations. Thirdly, That in theſe matters, thoſe whoſe own *weakneſs of underſtanding* is not able to conduct them through the miſts of diſpute, ought to make uſe of the beſt and ſafeſt *guides* to direct and lead them, and ſhould follow their counſel and advice. For it is manifeſtly the caſe of great multitudes of *adult Chriſtians in the World*, as hath been long obſerved, that their judgments are not ſo ſtrong and clear, but that, eſpecially in divers matters of *diſpute* (which are no part of the Chriſtian Creed) they muſt and do *follow the guidance* of others, and are led by their judgment, direction, and authority, where themſelves have not capacities to *judge* of the evidence of proofs. But here as the man who chuſeth an ill guide for his way, or an ignorant Phyſician

Aug. de utilit credendi c. 11, &c.

Phyſician to adviſe for his health, or an unſkilful Lawyer for his Eſtate; ſo he that followeth a *bad Leader* in matters concerning *Religion*, muſt bear in ſome reſpects the conſequents of his own bad choice.

10. And whereas ſome would have perſons to forbear practiſing in matters of *diſpute*, until themſelves be able by the capacities of their own judgments, throughly to *ſolve the difficulties objected*: they ought to have conſidered, that in moſt *practical diſputes* (as concerning Infant Baptiſm, the obſerving rules of order, and keeping Communion with a particular Church, and obeying the commands of Rulers) to forbear practiſing what ought to be performed, is to *yield to ſin*, and with *choice to act* againſt a duty; and to require this is alſo to proceed upon a principle, which will leave ſuch mens Conſciences under *inextricable difficulties*. For inſtance, if men were taught that none ought to bring their *Infant Children to be baptized*, until they were able themſelves judiciouſly to anſwer all that is urged to the contrary by the Anabaptiſts; this (if practiſed) would tend to make conſiderable numbers of *weak Chriſtians*, whoſe heads are not capable of *managing diſputes*, to neglect

their duty herein, and in practice to cloſe with the *Anabaptiſts.* But if again they were taught (which muſt needs be as reaſonable as the other) that they may not ſafely *chuſe to forbear* the bringing their Infants to Baptiſm, (becauſe even that choice is a *moral action*) unleſs they could clearly *refute* all thoſe great arguments, which prove this to be their duty; it will be manifeſt that in this caſe there can be no way to *diſentangle* the Conſciences of ſuch men of mean capacities, but only by *following the Directions* above given. And the like may be ſaid concerning other inſtances.

11. But that ſuch perſons who cannot themſelves *ſearch* into diſputes, may not be dangerouſly *miſguided*, two rules are to be obſerved, Firſt, that for them to be directed by the *general judgment*, principles, and practices of the *Primitive Church*, where that can be evidently and without contradiction diſcovered, by *skilful and faithful relaters* thereof, is a more ſafe courſe in any matter of diſpute, which themſelves cannot fathom, than to be led meerly by the judgment and *authority of any men*, or company of men, who oppoſe the ſame; becauſe the greater authority is to be preferred before the leſs; and by this rule many errours

V. Aug. cont. Greſcon. l. 1. c. 33.

rours of *Papiſts and Sectaries* may be rejected. Secondly, That where ſuch perſons of weak judgments cannot clearly underſtand either the grounds of truth under preſent debate, or the jndgment and practice of the ancient Church (whether through *defect*, or *diverſity* of information) it is their beſt and ſureſt way, ordinarily, to be directed and led by their *ſuperiours* who are over them in the *Church*, in the things they command, or the truths they recommend, rather than by the opinions of any other perſons whomſoever. 1. Becauſe God hath appointed them to be *teachers, leaders, and guides* to us: and therefore it is againſt the duty of our relation to them, and of the due ſubmiſſion we owe to them, and inconſiſtent with the duty of honouring our Rulers, to *cenſure their appointments* or inſtructions as evil, meerly upon the credit of any other perſons contrary opinion. 2. Becauſe they who *diſobey* the Conſtitutions of their Superiours, only out of reſpect to the *contrary judgment* of any other perſons, do not *diſobey out of Conſcience*, but out of prejudice and diſaffection: becauſe no principle of Conſcience can ordinarily *bind men*, who are not able to judge fully of the Caſe, to conclude their ſuperiours or Eccleſiaſti-

cal Governours to be in the *wrong*, and thoſe who oppoſe them to be in the *right*: and God commands *to obey them who have the rule over us*, cannot ſafely be overlooked out of reſpect to mens own *prejudices and diſaffections*. In this caſe it was well declared by Mr. *Baxter*, *that the duty of obeying being certain, and the ſinfulneſs of the thing commanded being uncertain and only ſuſpected, we muſt go on the ſurer ſide*, with much more to the ſame purpoſe. Now the obſerving theſe rules abovementioned, will both preſerve the *true freedom* of judgment and Conſcience, which when it proceedeth upon unerring evidence, is to be preferred before any humane authority, and it will alſo provide for the *eſtabliſhing of Truth, Unity, and Peace* in the Church, and will be the beſt *ſecurity* to the Souls and Conſciences of men: becauſe they who hold faſt the *Fundamentals* of Chriſtian Faith and Life, though in matters of a leſſer nature they ſhould *miſtake*, where they ſincerely *deſign* to practiſe their duty, ſo far as they can underſtand of themſelves, or are *inſtructed* by their *teachers*, without any *willing neglect* of duty towards God or Man; ſuch miſtakes or errors are not deſtructive to Salvation.

Diſp. of erem. c. 15. Sect. 3.

See Dr. Ferne's Conſiderations of concernment. c. 1.

12. Indeed S. *Paul* telleth his *Romans*,

Rom.

Rom. 14. 23. that *he that doubteth is damned* (or condemned, which ſome expound ſelf-condemned) *if he eat*, and that *whatſoever is not of Faith is ſin.* But as the Rules above expreſſed are means for the *ſatisfying doubts*, ſo this Apoſtolical Rule requiring a full and *well ſatisfied perſwaſion*, of a mans own judgment and knowledge in what he acteth, muſt be applyed to the ſpecial caſe intended, which is this; That whereſoever the *omitting* any action is certainly *free* from ſin, and the practice of it appeareth to any perſon *doubtful*, there to do that action is a very dangerous and evil practice; becauſe it containeth in it a chuſing to run the *hazard of Sin*; which choice is always a ſin: in ſuch a Caſe the Apoſtle alloweth no man to *engage upon any ſuch action*, until he be certainly perſwaded by an *undoubting knowledge* of the lawfulneſs thereof: And the ſame rule muſt take place when the practice of any thing is manifeſtly lawful, and the omiſſion doubtful. But the Caſe is very much different when both *acting* and *forbearing* may be *doubted* of; where the one of them is a duty; and it is impoſſible that *both* ſhould be *forborn*; and ſuch to ſome perſons is the queſtion above mentioned concerning Infant Baptiſm, obedience

ence to Rulers, *&c.* Nor doth the Apoſtle in this place deſign in general, that no Servant, Child, or Subject, may *eat* any thing, *obſerve* any *time religiouſly*, *obey* any command, or perform any other action; till he hath obtained ſo much knowledge, as to diſcern by an *undoubting judgment*, how theſe actions in their particular circumſtances are allowable by the Rules of Chriſtianity; for then the ignorant perſon ſhould be directed (till he becometh knowing) to be *idle and do nothing*, and to be *diſobedient* and under no command; but would ſcarce be allowed to live ſo long as to obtain knowledge. But God having commanded *Superiours to rule*, and *Inferiours to obey*, *to ſuſpend* all action here, is to *perform* an inward moral action of choice about a matter of duty, which if it be not regularly managed, is a ſin. And in this caſe ſo far as concerneth the obedience of a Child, Servant, or Subject, they ought to account their *ſuperiours command* to lay ſuch an obligation upon them to *duty*, that they muſt be guided thereby, unleſs they be able to *prove themſelves bound* to act the contrary.

13. *Aſſert.* 4. It is neither neceſſary nor poſſible that Eccleſiaſtical Conſtitutions ſhould not be liable to be *ſcrupled or ſuſpected*,

ſuſpected, where thoſe ſuſpicions and ſcruples are admitted without *ſufficient evidence* of evil in the things themſelves. I know that ſome have aſſerted that the Church and its Officers are *guilty of Schiſm if they appoint any thing not neceſſary* (or indifferent) *which is by others ſuſpected.* But that things in themſelves lawful and expedient may *lawfully be commanded*, though they be *groundleſly ſuſpected* or ſcrupled, appeareth, 1. Becauſe otherwiſe all rules of *Eccleſiaſtical order* would be unlawful, where people are *needleſly ſuſpicious and ſcrupulous*; and a great part of the authority of Princes, Parents, and Maſters would be abridged, if it muſt be limited by all the *unneceſſary ſuſpicions* of inferiours. *Mr. H. Treat of Schiſm.*

14. *Arg.* 2. From the Apoſtolical practice. When S. *Paul* had directed his *Corinthians*, that the men ſhould *pray uncovered, and the women covered*, adding 1 *Cor.* 11. 16. that *if any man will be contentious we have no ſuch Cuſtom nor the Churches of God*; he doth plainly enough expreſs, that what is duly and orderly *eſtabliſhed* in the Church, muſt take place notwithſtanding *contentions* and oppoſitions. And when the Apoſtolical Synod required the Gentiles to abſtain from *blood and things ſtrangled*; even that conſtitution

ſtitution might have been *ſcrupled*, and oppoſed; eſpecially conſidering that many Primitive Chriſtians were not preſently ſatisfied, by the Declaration of the Apoſtles, concerning *Chriſtian liberty*, as is manifeſt from *Rom.* 14. 2, 14, 20. Had not Chriſtians then been of another temper than many now are, and made up more of *Unity*, *humility*, *meekneſs*, and *peace*, than of *heats*, *parties*, *and controverſies*; they might have objected, that this was an *encroachment* upon Chriſtian *liberty*, whereby they were free from the whole Yoke of *Moſaical* Ceremonies; that it might ſeem to countenance the diſtinction of *things clean and unclean*, and to give occaſion to the Gentile Chriſtians to *Judaize*, as the *Galatians* did. It might alſo have been ſaid, that that Decree had an appearance of eſtabliſhing Chriſtianity upon *Judaiſm*, becauſe the Jews had a ſort of Proſelytes called גרי תושב *Proſelytes of converſe*, who were not circumciſed, but only enjoined to obſerve the *ſeven Precepts of the Sons of* Noah, to whom bloud was prohibited. And this Apoſtolical Decree together with other Chriſtian Precepts, did bind the Gentile Chriſtians to all the *ſame obſervations*. And it might alſo have been ſaid, that the forbidding bloud ſeemed a

Gemar. Sanhedr. c. 7. Sect. 5. Cocceius ibidem. Buxt Lexic. Rab. גיר.

Rite

Rite *peculiarly typical* of Chriſt to come, it being forbidden to the Jews upon this account, becauſe God had then appointed it to be the *means of making an atonement upon the Altar*, *Lev.* 17. 10, 11, 12. But notwithſtanding theſe things which are far from *ſolid arguments*, and yet to an indifferent perſon may poſſibly ſeem as plauſible, as many *exceptions* uſed by ſome men in other Caſes; that Apoſtolical Sanction was both *lawful and honourable*, yea though it concerned things *indifferent*, and was eſtabliſhed (as many think) by that *Eccleſiaſtical authority* which they committed to their Succeſſors in the Church.

15. *Arg.* 3. Becauſe there are many Caſes where ſomewhat is *neceſſary in genere* to be determined; and yet every *particular* under that general is liable to the like inconvenience of oppoſition. Here I ſhall chuſe to give a Foreign inſtance of that great *unneceſſary diſpute*, about the uſe of *leavened* or *unleavened bread* at the Euchariſt, where the one ſort is neceſſary to be determined before the adminiſtration, or otherwiſe the Ordinance it ſelf muſt be omitted. This hath occaſioned ſo great conteſt between the *Greek Church*, (who with the *Ruthenick* or *Ruſſian* contend for *Leavened bread*)

bread) and the Latin who would allow none other but *unleavened bread*, that they of the Greek Church have nick-named the Latines, *Azymitas*, and give this difference as one account, why they *refuſed Communion* with them, and did at *Conſtantinople* denounce an *Anathema* upon the uſe of *Unleavened bread*. The Latin Church did give many teſtimonies of its like fierceneſs for the uſe of *Unleavened Bread* only, ſo far that *Leo the ninth* undertook in this quarrel *to excommunicate Michael* the Patriarch of *Conſtantinople*. The main grounds of this controverſie (waving ſome frivolous things mentioned in *Gemma Animæ*, *Rupertus Tuitienſis*, *Durandus*, and other Ritualiſts) are theſe.

Maxim. Margunius in Dialogo adv. Lat.

Humbertus in Baron. Tom. 11. in Appendice.

Rup. Tuitien. de Div. Offic. l. 1. c. 22.

1. The Greek Church in a *peculiar notion*, as *Caſaubon* relateth their opinion from *Cedrenus* and *Xanthopulus*, think that Chriſt did eat the Paſsover, and inſtitute the Lords Supper the day before the Jews kept their Paſsover, and therefore they ſuppoſe he *uſed leavened bread*. But though divers Chriſtian Writers, as *Scaliger*, *Caſaubon*, *Grotius*, *Hoſpinian*, *Kellet*, and others both ancient and modern referred to by them, have thought that Chriſt did not *eat the Paſsover* the ſame day with the Jews; yet even that opinion is oppoſed by many others, and the argu-

Caſaub. in Baron. Exerc. 16.

Durand. Ration. l. 4. c. 41. n. 10.

Hieroz. P. 1. lib. 2. c. 50.

ments

ments for it are fully *anſwered by Bochartus.* And however the ſtrict *prohibitions* both of the *Law, Ex.* 12. 18. *Num.* 9. 11. *Deut.* 16. 3. and of the *Talmud*, againſt eating the Paſsover at any time with *Leavened Bread*, are evidences ſufficient, that this ſort of bread was not uſed by our Saviour. 2. The Greek Church alſo agreeth that *Unleavened Bread* was one of the *Ceremonial inſtitutions* of the Law of *Moſes*, and ſeveral ancient Canons of the Greek Church have forbidden them to have ſo much Communion with the *Jews*, as to eat of their *unleavened bread*, as a Jewiſh Rite; and *Maximus Margunius* a late Writer and Biſhop of that Church, out of a *ſtrange diſguſt*, ſuppoſeth that he ſmelleth the ſavour of many ancient Hereſies in *Unleavened Bread.*

Maccoth. c. 3. Sect. 2.

Can. Ap. 70. Conc. Laod. c. 38. Con. Trul. c. 11.

16. So that here is a Caſe, where ſome determination is neceſſary to the due order and the regular adminiſtration of Gods ordinance, where either leavened or *unleavened Bread* muſt be received; both theſe have been hotly oppoſed; the one ſide ſeeming to be favoured by the *Inſtitution of Chriſt*, and the other by the *abrogation of the law*, but neither of their arguments are concluſive, againſt the lawfulneſs of the others practice. In like manner

manner to adminiſter the Sacraments and other publick Offices *with a form* of Prayer may be oppoſed and *ſcrupled* by ſome; and to perform this without a form may as reaſonably be *diſliked* by others. And an Uniform appointed geſture at the Sacrament, and a decent fixed habit for Miniſters may be *ſuſpected* by ſome, who are ready to take all occaſions for ſuſpicion; and the want of theſe things are *deemed irreverent* and diſorderly, and therefore *unlawful* by others. Both the *French* and *Dutch* (as well as other Proteſtant) Churches, have theſe things determined; though both in the habit and geſture they differ from us and from each other, and yet there may be *objections* and pretences of *diſlike* raiſed againſt thoſe particular habits and geſtures, as well as againſt ours (as may in another place be ſhewed:) Wherefore either ſome things which may become or have been *matters of diſpute* may lawfully be ordered by Eccleſiaſtical Authority, or elſe there can be no ſecurity for the orderly exerciſe of Religion.

17. To theſe arguments it may be added, that the *prudence of the Church* would appear very contemptible to its adverſaries, if either its rules or practices about matters of order, ſhould be as mutable

mutable and various, as the uncertain and different thoughts of suspicious or scrupulous persons.

18. And the practice of all the *Protestant* Churches, who defended their established Orders both against *Anabaptists*, and other opposers thereof, do manifest their general judgment in this particular. And amongst other Churches when divers persons especially the *Flacians* raised vehement disputes and contentions both against the Doctrine and the *Ecclesiastical Ordinations* (or as *Reuterus* expresseth it, *de rebus quibusdam externis*) received in the Reformation of the Palatinate: *Frederic the third* in his Confession of Faith, contained in his last Will and Testament, and received among the *Corpus* or *Syntagma Confessionum* declareth, how he *had with good success withstood these oppositions*, and maketh it in that his last Testament his *principal admonition* to his Sons after him to beware of such persons, with other earnest expressions both of his and of his Son *Casimire*. *Quirin. Reuterus in Præfat. præfix. Ursini Oper.* *Casimir. in Præf. Conf. in Corp. Conf. & in Ursin. Vol. 2. in fol.*

19. And besides all this, this position that nothing may be established or imposed, about which any persons pretend scruple, is *destructive of it self*, or inconsistent with it self. For as its natural result tendeth to promote an *Universal*

toleration, of all practices and opinions, about which any perſons may pretend Conſcience which would include *all manner of Sects and Hereſies:* ſo the urging ſuch a toleration, where Governours either of Church or State judge, (as they have reaſon to do) that it would be *ſinful* in them *to admit it* and *countenance it*; is not only to undertake to *impoſe* upon their Governours, what is *ſcrupled* and oppoſed by them: but even to urge them to *approve* and allow what is *really ſinful*, and is rightly ſo eſteemed by them.

20. But the main objection to be here conſidered, is, that S. *Paul*, *Rom.* 14. 1, *&c.* commandeth *to receive them who are weak in the Faith, but not to doubtful diſputations*; and alloweth no *judging* or *deſpiſing* one another, for *eating or not eating meats*; and *for obſerving or not obſerving days:* and hence it is urged that no ſuch thing indifferent ought to be impoſed, but to be made the matter of *mutual forbearance*. Now it muſt be granted that Chriſtian Charity requireth a hearty and tender reſpect, to be had to every truly conſcientious perſon, ſo far as it may conſiſt with the more *general intereſt* of the Church of God: yet it is manifeſt that the Apoſtle is not in this Chap-

Commiſſ. Papers p. 70.

ter

ter treating about, and therefore not againſt the *rules of order* in the *ſervice of God.* But in order to a right underſtanding of this place I ſhall note three things.

21. Firſt, that theſe directions given by the Apoſtle, in the beginning of this Chapter, ſo far as they give *allowance* to the different practices therein mentioned, have a peculiar reſpect to thoſe times only of the firſt dawning of Chriſtianity; when moſt of the Jews who believed in Chriſt did as yet zealouſly retain the *Moſaical* Rites; abſtaining from certain meats as *judging them unlawful and unclean, Rom.* 14. 2, 14. and obſerving Jewiſh days and times out of a *peculiar eſteem* for them, *v.* 5. and yet this *for a time* was in this Chapter allowed and indulged by the Apoſtle. But *afterwards* the Rules and Canons of the Church ſeverely condemned all Chriſtians whether of Jews or Gentiles, who *obſerved* the *Moſaical Law*, and the Rites and diſtinction of meats contained therein, out of *Conſcience* thereunto: yea S. *Paul* himſelf vehemently condemned the *Galatians* who were Gentiles, for obſerving ſuch *diſtinctions of days* out of Conſcience to the Law, *Gal.* 4. 10, 11. and paſſeth the like cenſure upon the *Coloſſians* who *diſtinguiſhed meats*

Auguſt. Epiſt. 19. *Conc. Gangr. c.* 2. *Conc. Laod. c.* 29.

upon the ſame account, *Col.* 2. 20, 21, 22. Wherefore we muſt further obſerve, that in the Apoſtles times and according to the Rules they delivered to the Church, the *Gentile Chriſtians* were in theſe things with others *prohibited* the obſervation of the Law of *Moſes* and its Ceremonies, though many of them (as the *Galatians* and *Coloſſians*) were prone to judge this to be their neceſſary duty. *Act.* 21. 25. *Gal.* 5. 2. The *Jews among the Gentiles*, who did not yet underſtand that the Law of *Moſes* was abrogated, were *allowed* to obſerve its Rites, and to practiſe according to the Jewiſh Cuſtoms, *Act.* 21. 21, 24. *Gal.* 2. 12, 13. *Act.* 16. 3. But the *Jews* who lived in *Judæa* (and S. *Paul* himſelf when he was there) were *obliged or enjoined*, to obſerve the *Moſaical* Rites, though they were ſatisfied, that the binding power of the Law was abrogated, *Act.* 21. 24 *Gal.* 2. 12. Now in theſe different practices *allowed*, *determined*, and *ordered* by the directions and rules given by the Apoſtles, as *temporary proviſions* for the ſeveral ſorts or different Churches of Chriſtians; the Apoſtle requireth the Romans to receive and not to judge one another.

22. 2. When the Apoſtle commandeth them *to receive them who were weak in the Faith*;

Faith, he thereby intendeth that they ought to be owned & *judged as Chriſtians* notwithſtanding theſe different Obſervations, *v.* 1. And when he commandeth that *he that eateth ſhould not deſpiſe him that eateth not*, and *that he that eateth not ſhould not judge him that eateth*, *v.* 3. he forbiddeth the weaker Jews to condemn the other Jews or Gentiles, as if they were not poſſeſſed with the fear of God, becauſe they obſerved not the Law of *Moſes*: and prohibiteth thoſe others from *deſpiſing* or diſowning theſe weaker Jews as not having embraced Chriſt (ἐξουθενεῖν, *v.* 3. ſignifying here ſo to deſpiſe as withal to reject and diſclaim; as *Mar.* 9. 12. *Act.* 4. 11. 1 *Cor.* 1. 28.) becauſe they obſerved the Rites of Judaiſm. And to this ſenſe are manifeſtly deſigned the Apoſtles arguments whereby he enforceth theſe precepts, *V.* 3. *For God hath rereived him*, *v.* 4. *to his own Maſter he ſtandeth or falleth, for God is able to make him ſtand*, *v.* 6. he acteth with Conſcience *to God*; and *v.* 10. *Why doſt thou judge thy Brother, or why doſt thou ſet at nought thy Brother? We ſhall all ſtand before the judgment ſeat of Chriſt.* So that the main deſign of this part of this Chapter is this, To condemn them who preſs their own practices or judgments in things

unneceſſary, as being the *eſſential* and neceſſary points of Religion and Chriſtianity: and thereupon do undertake to *cenſure* all thoſe who differ from them in ſuch leſſer things, as having no true Religion or inward relation to, or Communion with Jeſus Chriſt, though they live never ſo conſcientiouſly, and act according to the beſt apprehenſions they can attain. To this purpoſe S. *Auſtin* expounded theſe words, *Non ferre audeamus ſententiam de alieno corde, quod non videmus:* and *Beza* ſaith upon them, *Rudes non debent ut extra ſalutis ſpem poſiti, damnari.* And this which is the true intent and ſcope of the Apoſtle in that place, doth in no wiſe *impugn* the uſe of *Eccleſiaſtical Authority*, in appointing what is orderly and expedient about things indifferent; but he will by no means allow, that leſſer things ſhould be eſteemed the *main matters of Religion* and Chriſtianity, to which purpoſe he layeth down that excellent Rule, in *v.* 17. *The Kingdom of God is not meat and drink, but righteouſneſs, peace, and joy in the Holy Ghoſt.*

Aug. Exp. prop. 78. ad Rom.

Beza in Loc.

23. 3. The conſidering the Apoſtolical practice; in *making Decrees* at the Council of *Jeruſalem*; in S. *Pauls ſetting orderly bounds* to the uſe of the extraordinary

dinary gifts of the Spirit, in the Church of *Corinth*, or *limiting* the exerciſe thereof to avoid confuſion; and his *not allowing* S. *Peter*, *Barnabas* and other Jews, to practiſe without controul what agreed with their preſent apprehenſions, under thoſe circumſtances, but was the way to diſadvantage the *peace* and *welfare* of the Church; and his giving commands for *order and decency*, with things of like nature, do evidence that it is a great miſunderſtanding of the Apoſtles Doctrine in this place, to conceive that he condemneth the *eſtabliſhing uſeful rules*, for the order and edification of the Church, though they do not always comply with every particular perſons apprehenſion.

24. But if it be further objected, that if thoſe things may be commanded or enjoined, which ſome perſons, though through miſtake, judge *unlawful*, either they muſt practiſe againſt their own judgments which would be *ſinful*; or their being conſcientious, will be their *diſadvantage*, which is not deſirable. To which I anſwer, 1. That if in ſome particular things, certain perſons through *meer miſtake* accompanied with *humility* and deſigns of *peace*, ſhould judge things lawful and expedient to be unlawful,

upon ſuch evidence which they apprehend to be full and ſufficient; and thereupon cannot yield to practiſe theſe things: it muſt be conſidered, that it is but the common attendant of mans being *fallible*, that he ſhould (out of reſpect to a greater good) bear ſome outward inconvenience, as the reſult even of his moſt *innocent errours*. Thus in *ſecular matters*, he who meerly miſtaketh the right way of *legal proceedings* about his own cauſe, may ſuffer ſome *damage* thereby; and though his caſe may herein deſerve pity, yet it is better he ſhould ſuſtain this conſequent of his own miſtake, than that no rules or orders of Law ſhould be obſerved. And the ſame may be ſaid of matters Eccleſiaſtical.

25. 2. If the Rules above mentioned be obſerved, they will direct how men may generally practiſe things lawfully enjoined, according to *right principles of Conſcience*. But if they be not obſerved, men muſt either reſolve to follow their own imaginations, in things they underſtand not, which is a manifeſt way of *errour* and walking in the *dark*; or elſe they muſt in theſe things practiſe according to the directions of thoſe, who ſpeak moſt plauſibly and takingly to their

affections,

affections, and are alſo *ſtrict* in their lives: but this both *overlooketh* the duty of obedience and the due relation to *guides* and teachers, and is a very probable way to *miſguide* men both in this and in other Caſes. By following this *rule*, or rather by being taken in this *ſnare*, many anciently embraced the monſtrous poſitions of *Manicheiſm*, perſwaded thereto by *Fauſtus* who had *eloquium ſeductorium* (as S. *Aug.* calleth it) *the enticing eloquence of ſeducing*; and whoſe words were obſerved by the ſame Father to have a *more pleaſing and delightful ſweetneſs than the eloquence of S.* Ambroſe *which was more learned and ſubſtantial*; and thoſe who embraced that impious Hereſie were always talking of *God* and *Chriſt*, and the *Holy Spirit the Comforter*. And to be guided in opinions or doctrines by ſuch reſpect to perſons can be no ſafe way of conduct, (becauſe God hath not directed Chriſtians thereto;) for as to expreſſion, *Luther* accounted *Julian* the *Pelagian* to be a *better ſpeaker* and Orator than S. *Auguſtine*; and as to practice *Nazianzen* declared even of the *Macedonians* who denied the Divinity of the Holy Spirit, that they were perſons whoſe *lives were to be admired, though their Doctrines were not to be allowed*. And therefore that more

Aug. Conf. l. 6. c. 3, 6, 13.

Baron. ad An. 377. n. 7.

Luther. Judicium de Eraſmo Tom. 2.

Naz. Orat. 44.

more ancient rule of *Tertullian* is of neceſſary uſe; *Non ex perſonis probamus fidem, ſed ex fide perſonas*, that *we are not to examine and eſteem the Faith by the perſons, but the perſons by their Faith.* Therefore the beſt way to be rightly eſtabliſhed, is by having a Conſcientious regard in the firſt place to the *evidence* of manifeſt truth clearly diſcerned, and in the next place to *ſpiritual guides* and teachers, it being one end why God appointed Church Officers, *Eph.* 4. 11.-- 14. *that we be henceforth no more Children toſſed to and fro, and carried about with every wind of Doctrine.*

SECT. IV.

Of Eccleſiaſtical Rites which have been abuſed *in any corrupt way of worſhip.*

1. It is acknowledged that ſome geſture, garment, and action (though not the ſame *individually*, but of the like kind or phyſical nature) eſtabliſhed in the Church of *England*, hath been *ill uſed* in the Church of *Rome*; and this hath been much of old and by ſome of late objected againſt theſe appointments. Now we do aſſert that the worſhip of God who is a jealous God, is to be preſerved *pure*,

pure, and not mixed with any *ſinful defilement* whatſoever, whether of *Idolatry* or *ſuperſtition*; and that things otherwiſe indifferent, which either in the *deſign* of them who uſe them, or in their own *preſent tendency*, do directly promote or propagate ſuch corruptions, do in that Caſe become things unlawful. Hence that which was in it ſelf indifferent; and was uſed in the *Pagan Idolatry*, might upon good grounds be diſclaimed as unlawful to Chriſtians, (by *Tertullian* and other ancient Writers) where the preſent uſe among Chriſtians might appear to *countenance* and *confirm* thoſe Idolatrous practices. But that the uſe of things in themſelves lawful and expedient, and known to be *ordered* to a *lawful end* and purpoſe, ſhould be condemned as ſinful; becauſe theſe things or the like, are or have been, otherwhere *ſinfully abuſed*, is a poſition by no means to be admitted. Concerning which in general, (beſides what ſhall be added concerning our particular Rites, *Ch.* 4.) I ſhall content my ſelf with theſe three Obſervations.

2. *Obſ.* 1. This poſition is not conſiſtent with the *principles* of Chriſtian *practice*. It is a ground of hope in the Goſpel Regeneration, that thoſe bodies and Souls which were once *abuſed* to the ſervice

vice of falſe Gods and Devils (as according to Gr. *Nazianzen* was once the Caſe of S. *Cyprian*; and according to S. *Paul*, of the *Corinthians*, *Theſſalonians*, and others, 1 *Cor.* 12. 2. 1 *Theſſ.* 1. 9.) and to the ſervice of ſin (as were the members of the *Roman Church*, *Rom.* 6. 17, 18, 19.) may yet find acceptance with God in ſerving him. Surely none can think that S. *Pauls tongue* was not to be allowed to preach the Goſpel, becauſe it had been abuſed to blaſpheme: nor is it amiſs obſerved by *Durandus*, that among other Scriptures there is a principal uſe made in the Church of God, of what was written by *David* who was guilty of *Adultery*, S. *Matthew* who was a *Publican*, and S. *Paul* who was a *perſecutor and blaſphemer*; and among the Fathers of S. *Auguſtine* who was a *Manichee*. And ſurely it is much more incredible, that through the ill uſe of ſome, the whole *Species* of actions, geſtures, and things ſhould become unlawful and unclean. Can any poſſibly imagine, that if other men have or do *lift up their Eyes* to Heaven, to adore the Sun or Moon, or *bow down* their knees to give religious worſhip to an Idol, or to Saints and Angels, this muſt render our lifting up our eyes to Heaven in the worſhipping of God, or bowing

Naz. Orat. 18.

Dur. Rational. l. 1. *c.* 1. *Sect.* 33.

our

our knees in prayer to him, to be ſinful? Or may not one man lawfully make uſe of the *light of the Sun* to read the holy Scriptures, becauſe another maketh uſe of it to commit Villanies? or did *Judas* his *Kiſs* make the Kiſs of Charity ſinful?

3. As *Sozomen* reporteth, *ſingle Merſion* in Baptiſm was uſed by *Eunomius*, who diſowned the *Trinity*; and the *threefold Merſion* which was the more general ancient Cuſtom, was abuſed in *Spain*, as *Walafridus Strabo* relateth, to expreſs thereby a denyal of one Eſſence in the three perſons of the *Trinity*; upon which occaſion the *Council of Toledo* enjoined ſingle Merſion in *Spain*: ſtill declaring according to S. *Gregory*, that in the *uſe either of ſingle or trinal Merſion there is ſufficient Baptiſm.* And it is well obſerved by *Strabo*, that if we muſt relinquiſh the uſe of all things which have been *perverted*, there will nothing of this nature remain allowable. And whereas God *loſeth no right* of Soveraignty to any Creature by mans abuſe, it was not without good reaſon acknowledged and aſſerted by S. *Auſtin*, that the Chriſtians did lawfully *uſe thoſe Fountains*, where the Gentiles drew Water for their Sacrifices: and as *Theodoret* declareth they owned the

Sozom. Hiſt. Eccl. l. 6. c. 26.

Conc. Tol. 4. c. 5.

Theod. Hiſt. l. 3. c. 14.

the ſame liberty under *Julian* the Emperour, who deſigned to *defile the Fountains and meats with Pagan pollutions.*

4. *Obſ.* 2. This poſition if granted would be ſuch an *Engine* which would *do more work*, than they who place it would willingly allow of, and would extirpate divers uſeful things referring to religious worſhip, which are ordered by humane Wiſdom and Prudence. Of all external things the *individual Temple or Church*, in which corrupt Religion was performed, may ſeem as much defiled thereby as any *ſpecies* of action or geſture can be; and yet even the Directory declared, that *ſuch places are not ſubject to any ſuch pollution, by any ſuperſtition formerly uſed and now laid aſide, as may render them Unlawful or inconvenient*; and S. *Auſtin* declareth, that even *Idols Temples when their uſe is changed to the honour of God, may be lawfully ſo employed, as well as perſons may be received to God, who are converted to the true Religion.* Eccleſiaſtical *revenues* for the ſupport of the Miniſtry and Univerſities, have been, and in the Romiſh Church ſtill are *abuſed*, as much as any other external thing, to be the *great ſupport* of a corrupt Religion: and yet the continuance of theſe things is well allowed of, by diſſenters from

Direct. of the day and place of worſhip.

Aug. Ep. 154.

from this Church. The ſame may be ſaid, concerning the times of attending upon the publick ſervice of God, *Morning* and *Evening*. And notwithſtanding the groſs abuſe of *Bells* in the time of Popery, Mr. *Rutherford* declareth it *unreaſonable and groundleſs, that thereupon they ſhould be diſuſed*. And if this poſition was admitted as doctrinally true; the pretence of their *convenient uſefulneſs* would be no better *excuſe* on their behalf, than was that *Plea* for ſparing the beſt of the Amalekites Cattel, that they might be a Sacrifice, when God had utterly devoted them to deſtruction; and therefore the admitting this poſition it ſelf would be as the coming down of a violent torrent, which inſtead of ſcouring the Chanel, will overflow and drown all the Country. *Of Ceremonial Qu. 5. & Qu. 6.*

5. *Obſ.* 3. Where this is admitted, the general grounds of the Proteſtant Reformation muſt be diſowned. The *Bohemian* Church which led the Van, openly profeſſed that *ſuch Rites and Ceremonies ought to be retained, which do advantage Faith, the worſhip of God, Peace and order; whomſoever they had for their Author, Synodum, Pontificem, Epiſcopum, aut alium quemvis.* And both *Luther* and the *Auguſtan* Confeſſion, declare the like purpoſe *Conf. Boh. Art. 15.* *Luth. Formul. Comm. pro Eccl. Witemb.*

Conf. Auguſt. c. 3. Abuſ. de Miſſa. poſe and practice to have been in the *German Reformation.* And *Zanchy* aſſerteth, that this is the *true way of reforming the Church*, (which he wiſheth all would mind, after the example of the *Bohemian* Brethren) *not to root out every thing that was found in the Church of* Rome, *but to reject what was fit to be rejected, and to preſerve what was fit to be preſerved.* That this was deſigned in the Reformation of the Church of *England*, appeareth from the *Preface* in the Book of Common-Prayer concerning Ceremonies, from the *Apology* of the Church of *England*, and from the Book of *Canons*, expreſſing according to that Apology a very plain Declaration hereof.

Zanch. Epiſt. l. 1. in Ep. ad Craton.

Can. 30.

6. The Arguments urged for the proof of this poſition, are ſuch as do not need any long anſwer. For whereas *Jehu his breaking down the Houſe of Baal* is commended in the Scripture, and neither *he* nor *Jehoiada* reſerved the Houſe of *Baal*, to be a place of *Synagogue worſhip.* This action might be neceſſary for the effecting a reformation, and the *diſentangling* the people from their Idolatry, and upon a like account *Hezekiah* brake in pieces the brazen Serpent, which God himſelf had appointed, when the people did *colere eum tanquam idolum, give worſhip to*

Aug. de Civ. Dei l. 10. c. 8.

to it as to an Idol, as S. *Aug.* expreſſeth it: and to the ſame end the *ancient Chriſtians*, in ſome ſpecial Caſes, where they feared that the continuance of the Idols Temples, might tend to uphold the honour of the Idol, did *raze them to the foundations*, and ſometimes *erected anew Chriſtian Churches* in their places. But beſides this the Jews had ſuch poſitive Laws as theſe, *Thou ſhalt quite pluck down all their high places*, Num. 33. 52. *Ye ſhall utterly deſtroy all the places where the Nations ſerved their Gods*, Deut. 12. 2. *Ye ſhall deſtroy all their graven Images*, Deut. 7. 25. Ch. 12. 13. and the proper extent of theſe Laws enjoined them utterly to deſtroy all *Monuments and places* formerly uſed to Idolatry, out of the land of *Iſrael*. But whereas no ſuch poſitive commands are given to Chriſtians, if they ſhould think themſelves bound to follow theſe Jewiſh Patterns, Mr. *Rutherford* himſelf condemneth them as *judaizing in this particular*,

Euſ. de Vit. Conſt. l. 4. c. 39.

Tr. of Scandal. Q. 6.

7. And when God commandeth the *Iſraelites* that they ſhall not do *after the doings of the land of* Egypt, *and the Land of* Canaan, *Lev.* 18. 3. which Mr. *Rutherford* objecteth againſt our Rites: The deſign of that place is, that the *Iſraelites*

Ibid. Q. 7.

ought to be *guided* by the holy Laws and Commandments of God, in their Converſations, and not to follow the *debauched examples* of other Nations mentioned in the following part of that Chapter, nor the *abominable idolatries* of their worſhip. But in matters in themſelves *lawful*, where God had given them no particular Ceremonial commands to the contrary, they were not tyed to *diſclaim* all expedient things practiſed by other Nations; in *civil* actions they might eat bread and drink water, yea plow and reap in the ſame manner with other Nations; and in circumſtances of *Religion*, though *ſacrificing and bowing* were manifeſtly rites of adoration, uſed by idolatrous Nations, before the giving the Law, they were ſtill received under the Law, and *appointed* thereby: and though the *Philiſtines* had long before the time of *David an Houſe or Temple* of *Dagon*, for the place of their Sacrifice, *Judg.* 16. 23, 29, 30. 1 *Chr.* 10. 10. *David's* purpoſe of *building an Houſe or Temple* to the Lord was never the leſs allowable.

Hook. Eccleſ. Polity l.4.Sect.6.

*Ex.*34.13. *Num.*25.2.

8. But beſides this, it is chiefly to be conſidered, that the things deſigned for the matter of this objection, are quite

of

of a *different nature*, from the Case and Question to which they are applyed. It is acknowledged that for any persons purposely to design to *model* the *Christian worship*, according to the Rites of Pagan and *idolatrous original* and use, (which would be to run parallel with what is aimed at in this objection) is certainly wicked and intolerable. But since the intent of the present enquiry, concerneth *ancient Christian Rites* used by us, and abused in the Romish degeneracy; it would be nearer to our state to enquire, Whether God ever gave any command, that his Church should *relinquish*, whatsoever even the *Pagans imitated*, abused, or prophaned? as *Belshazzer profaned* the Temple Vessels, many of which were only voluntarily dedicated, 2 *Chron.* 15. 18. and *Julian* appointed among the Gentiles a *resemblance* of the order of the publick Christian service; and many things especially in the *Grecian Idolatry*, have been proved a kind of *apish imitation* of some things in the Jewish worship. Yet since the Papists are not *Pagans*, but Christians of a *corrupt profession*, that the Case of the Jews may fully answer ours, it must be thus stated: Whether the things *laudably used* in the

Nazianz. Or. 3. *Sozom.* l. 5. c. 15.

Delph. Phanic. cap. 11.

ſervice of God, in the ancient times of the Jewiſh Church, which were not directly *inſtituted* of God (as their rules for the ordering their Synagogue worſhip, and Officers) ought to be rejected in the *reformation* of *Hezekiah* or *Joſiah*, ſo far as theſe things were *received or imitated* in the corrupt worſhip of the ten Tribes? and this is that which I preſume no man will have the *confidence to aſſert*. And as it is manifeſt, that the ten Tribes did in their worſhip *deſignedly imitate* many things in the Jewiſh Temple worſhip, *Amos* 4. 4, 5. *Ch.* 5. 21, 22, 23. ſo they retaining among them the *Sons of the Prophets*, it is not to be doubted but they reſerved an *imitation* of the Jewiſh *Synagogue worſhip*, or Weekly Aſſemblies.

9. But it is time to conſider the particular things, actions, or geſtures, appointed in our ſervice. *Geſtures* are ſo neceſſary, as inſeparable attendants to the body, that there is no reaſon to place expedient geſtures among the number of *Ceremonies*: yet becauſe *kneeling* at the Lords Supper is eſpecially ſo eſteemed, and thereupon by ſome oppoſed, it will be requiſite to expreſs ſomewhat concerning geſtures as well as other Rites;

and

and to manifeſt how little reaſon there is for the *Cenſures* paſſed upon theſe particular Rites, by divers at home, and ſome *few perſons abroad*, who for the moſt part proceeded upon ſome *miſinformation*, or *miſunderſtanding* of our affairs.

CHAP. III.

Of devout and becoming geſtures in the ſervice of God.

SECT. I.

Of the Geſture at Prayer, Praiſe, and Chriſtian profeſſion of Faith.

1. THat a *reverent behaviour* is a duty, in our approaches to God in Prayer and other religious exerciſes, is ordinarily acknowledged, but by many too much neglected. And as the moſt devout and *humble geſtures* were ordinarily uſed in Prayer under the Old Teſtament, ſo under the new our Saviour himſelf prayed *upon his knees*, *Luk.* 22. 41. and ſo did St. *Paul* with the Diſciples both of *Epheſus* and *Tyre*, *Act.* 20. 36. *Ch.* 21. 5. And though the Primitive Church, upon the Lords days, and from *Eaſter* to *Whitſunday prayed ſtanding*, manifeſting thereby their abundant joy and hope by Chriſts Reſurrection; yet *kneeling* was eſteemed their ordinary geſture of Prayer; whence *Euſebius* declaring the admirable effect of the Prayers of the Chriſtian

Euſeb. Ec. Hiſt. l. 5. c. 5.

Christian Legion, (called the thundring Legion) in the Army of *Aurelius*, saith, that they *kneeled down upon the ground*, κατὰ τὸ ἰδιωτικὸν ἐπὶ τῶν εὐχῶν τύπον *according to the ordinary Custom the Christians used in Prayers*; upon which account *Tertullian* calleth their Prayers *Geniculationes*, or their falling on their knees; and from hence divers Christians contracted upon their knees an hard *brawniness like that of the Camels*, as S. *Hierome* relateth concerning *S. James*, and S. *Gregory* concerning *Tarsilla* his Fathers Sister. And that the great and good Emperour *Constantine*, did in his Closet *four times every day put up his Prayers to God upon his knees*, is expressed by *Eusebius*; and these things are the more worthy our imitation because it needeth no other proof but *common experience*, that where there is a neglect of external reverence in the service of God, it tendeth to *abate* the inward *fear* of God, and the devoutness of Religion, and therefore *Kneeling at Prayer* which is enjoined with us, is very useful.

Ad Scapul. c. 4.

Greg. in Evang. Hom. 38.

De Vita Const. l. 4. c. 21.

2. The injunction of this gesture in Prayer was esteemed so warrantable by *Calvin*, that he declareth it to be such an humane Constitution, as is grounded on the word of God; *and to be so humane*,

Inst. l. 4. c. 10. Sect. 30.

that it is alſo divine, being a part of that decency the Apoſtles commended. But no more need be added in ſo plain a Caſe: only it may be here obſerved, that the expediency of kneeling at the *abſolution*, at the *commandments*, and the *receiving Impoſition of hands* is hence alſo manifeſted; becauſe (beſides what may be ſaid from the proper ſubject matter of each of them) to every Commandment, in our Liturgy is adjoined an humble *Petition* for pardon and grace; the abſolution is intended to enclude a *concomitant Prayer*, as may be collected from the Rubrick following the abſolution in the Morning Service; and the impoſition of hands encludeth a *benedictory ſupplication.*

3. *Standing* to praiſe and give glory to God is ſometimes enjoined in our Liturgy. Now this duty of giving glory to God, is ſometimes performed in a way of *humiliation* and Confeſſion, under a ſenſe of the glorious Soveraignty, majeſty, and juſtice of God, in which reſpect the geſture of *kneeling* or *falling down* is ſuitable thereto, being practiſed *Rev.* 4. 10, 11. And frequently in the Chriſtian Aſſemblies, the giving glory to God is performed in *magnifying* the Glorious Trinity in a way of *joy, praiſe, and thankfulneſs,*

thankfulneſs, and with reference to the grace and mercy of God; and to this end the geſture of *ſtanding up* hath been thought proper to be practiſed and enjoined both under the Old and the New Teſtament. The *Levites* were appointed by *David to ſtand every Morning to thank and praiſe the Lord, and alſo at even*, 1 *Chr.* 23. 30. the Jews were commanded by the *Levites to ſtand up and praiſe the Lord*, *Neh.* 9. 5. and in S. *John's* Viſion of the encreaſe of the Chriſtian Church to ſo great a multitude, which no man could number of all Nations, Kindreds, and people, *he ſaw them ſtanding before the Throne and the Lamb, and ſaying, ſalvation to our God which ſitteth upon the Throne and to the Lamb*, *Rev.* 7. 9, 10. In the former times of the Chriſtian Church when the Pſalms were ſung by *all the Aſſembly*, they ordinarily performed this ſervice in a *ſtanding* poſture as *Amalarius* declareth, *Dum cantamus Pſalmos, ſolemus ſtare:* but when they were ſometimes ſung by *one perſon alone* (the uſage of the Church in ſuch indifferent things not being always the ſame) in the Weſtern Church, in the time of *Caſſian* they all *ſtood up at the end of the Pſalms, with joint voices to render glory to God.*

Amalarius de Eccleſ. Offic. l. 4. c. 3.

Caſſian. Inſt. l. 2. c. 8.

4. *Standing at the Creed* is a viſible ſign

ſign or token of the *profeſſion* of the Faith therein contained; which profeſſion is a duty much required in the holy Scripture, and is one part of our glorifying God, for which Religious Aſſemblies of Divine Worſhip are intended. In the Creed we profeſſedly *acknowledge* the three perſons in the glorious Trinity to be the only true God, and our only Lord; and a *ſtanding poſture* well becometh a *ſervant*, in his profeſſed owning and attending upon his Maſter: we openly declare every one for our ſelves (*I believe*, &c.) the ground of our Chriſtian hope and comfort, that believing in the Father who made the World; in the Son who died, roſe again, aſcended, and ſhall judge all men; and in the Holy Ghoſt we have *expectation* in the Church of God, and the Communion of Saints, of obtaining forgiveneſs of ſins, reſurrection, and everlaſting life; and do alſo *acknowledge* all theſe Articles of the Chriſtian Faith: and a *ſtanding geſture* is very ſuitable to any *ſolemn Declaration* of our minds, in matters of moment and concernment. And as the *profeſſion of Faith* encludeth a *ſtedfaſt reſolution*, to continue firm in the acknowledgment of the Chriſtian Doctrine, this is ſo properly ſignified by the *ſtanding* geſture, according to the general apprehenſions

prehenſions of the World, that both עמד in Hebrew, and ἵστημι in Greek (which are words expreſſing the ſtanding geſture) are in the holy Scripture uſed to ſignifie an *aſſerting* with *reſolution*, *Deut.* 25. 8. 2 *Chr.* 34. 32. 1 *Cor.* 16. 13. 2 *Theſ.* 2. 15. and the like *Idioms* of ſpeech are in ſome other languages as well as our own deſigning to expreſs what we reſolve to *ſtand to.*

SECT. II.

Of Standing up at the Goſpel.

1. *Standing at the Goſpel* is appointed in our Liturgy, of which a very reaſonable, true, and good account may be given. Some Ritualiſts have told us, that the Weſtern Church ſtood up at the *Goſpel* and not at the *Epiſtle*, becauſe the Goſpel containeth matters of *Faith* and *Belief*, the *Epiſtle* conſiſteth of Rules of *life* and *practice*; and that the *Goſpel* and not the *Epiſtle* expreſſeth the very *words ſpoken by Chriſt.* But I account not theſe reaſons ſufficient, partly becauſe the *Goſpels* for ſome days do not *contain*, and the *Epiſtles* for ſome days do contain the points of *Chriſtian Faith*, and the expreſs *words of Chriſt*, and partly becauſe

cauſe by inſiſting on theſe things alone, we can have no reaſon antecedent to the appointment, why ſtanding at the Goſpel ſhould be required with us, and not at the *Second Leſſon* in the Morning Service.

2. Wherefore I obſerve, 1. That in the devouter times, both of the Jewiſh and Chriſtian Church it was frequently obſerved by the people to manifeſt their *reverence* unto the *Holy Scriptures* by ſtanding up at the reading thereof. When *Ezra opened the Book of the Law, all the people ſtood up*, Neh. 8. 5. and the *Children of Iſrael ſtood up in their places to read the Law of the Lord*, Neh. 9. 3. and our bleſſed Saviour who according to the Cuſtom of the Jewiſh Doctors taught ſitting, *ſtood up to read the words of the Prophet*, Luk. 4. 16. 20. *Junius* obſerveth this as one thing wherein the practice of the Jewiſh Synagogue and the Chriſtian Church did agree, *ſi verbum Dei ipſum legitur ſtat erecta auditorum corona, that when the word of God was read the whole Aſſembly ſtood up*; which obſervation was true concerning ſome times of the Jewiſh Church and of the principal parts of the Chriſtian Church. Wherefore though *Sozomen* relateth that the *Alexandrian Biſhop* did not ſtand up at the reading the

Salian. Annal. Eccleſ. A. M. 3447. *n.* 16.

Eccleſiaſtici lib. 1. *c.* 4.

Sozom. l. 7. *c.* 19.

the Goſpel; yet he noteth it as ſuch a *peculiar uſage*, that he had not ſeen nor heard the like any where elſe.

3. And though in the Jewiſh Church the people (and among them our Saviour, *Luk.* 2. 46.) uſually *ſat to hear* their Doctors; and the ancient Chriſtians ſometimes heard their Sermons and Exhortations in the ſame geſture, as may be collected from *Juſtin Martyrs* ſecond Apology; yet *Euſebius* acquainteth us that *Conſtantine* that famous Emperor (whoſe practice doubtleſs was not ſingular) would not hear a *Sermon or Treatiſe about divine things in a ſitting, but only in a ſtanding poſture*, as judging it *not allowable* to do otherwiſe. And that in the *African Churches* they did even until S. *Auſtins* days generally ſtand, both at *Sermons* and all *Leſſons* out of the Scriptures, is manifeſt from what he expreſſeth to that purpoſe. And ſuch reſpect was ſhewed even among *barbarous Nations* to what was dictated from God, that *Eglon King of Moab, when Ehud told him he had a meſſage from God unto him, did ariſe out of his Seat*, Jud. 3. 20.

Euſeb. de Vit. Conſt. l. 4. c. 33.

Aug. Hom. 16.

4. *Obſ.* 2. Out of *tenderneſs* to the weakneſs and infirmity of many Chriſtians, liberty was granted to them that they might hear the *longer Leſſons*, or portions

Aug. ibidem. tions of holy Scripture *sitting*; but as a testimony of their honour to the whole, they were required at the reading other portions of Scripture *to stand up*. S. *Austin* telleth us how he *gave Counsel and in some sort made supplication, that those who were infirm and not well able to stand, might humbly and attentively hear the longer Lessons sitting:* but in the same place he maketh complaint, that this liberty *granted only to the infirm* in those *African* Churches, was taken by others more generally than was intended or allowed. And to somewhat a like liberty the words of *Amalarius* in the ninth Century seem to refer, who saith *in recitatione lectionis sedere solemus aut silendo stare, it is our Custom either to sit, or to stand with silence when the Lesson is read.* And whereas in the Christian Church, the Law and Prophets (with some of the *Apocrypha*) and the Gospels and Epistles were publickly read in their Assemblies, as is manifest both from Councils, Fathers, and Ritual Writers; the Latine Church enjoined standing up at the *Gospel only* (which was ordinarily short) for many hundred years past, the Greek Church as *Micrologus* relateth, stood up *also at the Epistle* which was likewise short, and so did also the *Churches of Russia* as *Cassander* observeth

Amalar. de Eccles. Offic. l. 4. c. 3.

Microl. c. 9.

Cassand. Liturg. c. 5.

veth from the Hiſtory of *Sigiſmundus Liberus.* For though a poſture of *reverent reſpect* to the word of God is very ſuitable whenſoever it is read; yet that the Church ſhould allow a liberty to hear the *longer Leſſons ſitting* while this particular reverence is expreſſed only at the reading ſome ſhorter portion of the Scripture, is very allowable; becauſe it is well obſerved by *Amalarius*, that the Apoſtles themſelves did ſometimes hear the Scriptures read in the Jewiſh Synagogue *ſitting*, as is evident from *Act.* 13.14, 15, 16. Where *they entred into the Synagogue and ſat down, and after the reading the Law and the Prophets, Paul* ſtood up. *De Eccl. Offic. l. 3. c. 11.*

5. *Obſ.* 3. *Standing* at a ſhort portion of the Goſpel, rather than at any other portion of the Scripture, is *reaſonably choſen* to expreſs reverence to the holy word of God, becauſe the *actions and words* of our bleſſed Saviour are for the moſt part therein contained. In the Primitive Church while the fervour of true devotion did continue, they heard the Writings of the Apoſtles read with that high eſteem and veneration as if they had then *ſeen the Apoſtles faces* and received thoſe words from *their mouths*; which *Tertullian* thus expreſſeth, *Authenticæ literæ eorum* (*ſc.* Apoſtolorum) *recitantur ſonantes* *Tertul. de Præſcrip. c. 36.*

ſonantes vocem, & repræſentantes faciem uniuſcujuſq; eorum. And in like manner they heard the words of the Goſpel as if they had *ſeen Chriſt himſelf*, and received theſe words from his mouth. And though all divine truth be therefore highly valuable becauſe it is from God: yet ſo far as concerneth the *deliverer*, it was requiſite (and warranted by the Scriptures, *Mat.* 21. 37. *Heb.* 2. 1, 2, 3. *Ch.* 3. 3.) that thoſe who lived when Chriſt was in the fleſh, ſhould ſhew the *higher reſpect* of the two to *Chriſt himſelf ſpeaking* (whoſe words are ordinarily in the Goſpel) than to *his Apoſtles* who were ſent by him. Wherefore *Ignatius* accounteth the Goſpel to have this excellency in it, *viz. the preſence of our Saviour Jeſus Chriſt, and his ſuffering and reſurrection.* And out of ſpecial reſpect to our *Lord and Saviour*, it was the Cuſtom of the ancient Greek Church, to ſtand up when ever the *Book of the four Evangeliſts* was opened, or any Leſſon read from thence, though the geſture of ſitting was allowed at the hearing any other Books of Scripture: ſo that the liberty of ſitting even at any Leſſons from the Goſpel was not there *indulged* (the practice of divers Churches being in theſe things not always the ſame) where the ſame

Ign. Ep. ad Philadelph.

Chryſoſt. de Circo. Conſt. Apol. l. 2. c. 57.

ſame liberty was allowed concerning the other Scriptures.

6. Wherefore to ſhew that *outward reſpect* to the holy Scriptures, which both the Jewiſh and Chriſtian Churches have *owned*, and wherein our *Bleſſed Lord* hath given us an *example* to ſtand up at the reading them, is reaſonable and unblameable. And the *liberty allowed* for ſitting at the other Scriptures, which for order ſake is fit to be uſed, doth not countenance any want of *high reſpect* to all Divine truth, which is expreſſed by manifeſting this reſpect to a particular ſhort part thereof; and that part is to this purpoſe choſen wherein the words and actions of our Lord and Maſter do frequently occur.

SECT. III.

Of the fitneſs of kneeling at the Communion, and the geſture at the Inſtitution of that Sacrament conſidered.

1. To *kneel* at the receiving the Holy Communion hath been judged a geſture very expedient and commendable upon divers reſpects. 1. Becauſe this Sacrament doth in a ſpecial manner *exhibit* a myſtical and ſpiritual *Communion* with

Chriſt, or the Communion of his bodie and bloud; and the greateſt reverence and moſt humble geſture is very convedient for ſo ſolemn an Ordinance, and ſo near an *approach* to Jeſus Chriſt, eſpecially ſince in this great Ordinance there ought to be a *devout religious worſhip* performed unto Chriſt himſelf. Kneeling therefore is a fit geſture of adoration performed in this Ordinance unto God and Jeſus Chriſt, which is the more inoffenſively performed, becauſe our Church hath openly declared againſt any *adoration either of the Sacramental Bread and Wine, or of any corporal preſence of Chriſts natural fleſh and bloud therein.* 2. Becauſe of the greatneſs of the *benefits* conveyed in this Ordinance to the worthy receiver, ſuch as the Grace of God and remiſſion of ſins in the bloud of Chriſt: and if he who receiveth ſome great gift, or ſome great pardon from his *Prince*; doth fitly receive it kneeling: and the *Pœnitentes* in the ancient Church, always received *Eccleſiaſtical abſolution* from the Rulers of the Church upon their *knees*, in token of their ſubmiſſive humility; much more he who cometh unto Chriſt in this Sacrament, to receive from him the *remiſſion of his ſins*, tendred in his bloud of the New Teſtament ſhould appear

Rubr. after Communion.

pear before him with humility. To this purpoſe *Kneeling* at the Sacrament is in our Liturgy declared to be for a *ſignification of an humble and grateful acknowledgment, of the benefits of Chriſt therein given to all worthy receivers*; and Mr. *Hooker* ſaith very well, *coming as receivers of the ineſtimable Grace at the hand of God, what doth better beſeem our bodies at that hour than to be ſenſible witneſſes of minds unfeignedly humbled?* *Ibidem.* *Eccleſ. Pol. l. 5. c. 68.*

2. 3. Kneeling is a ſuitable geſture for humble *Prayer* and ſolemn *thankſgiving*, both which may be fitly exerciſed at the receiving this Sacrament. For *religious Prayer* becometh him who there affectionately deſireth to be made partaker of the benefits of Chriſts Paſſion; and therefore the Communicant ſhould devoutly join in, and in heart ſay *Amen* to thoſe Petitions at the delivery of the Elements, which peculiarly refer to himſelf. *The body of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt which was given for thee, preſerve thy Body and Soul to everlaſting life*, and *The bloud of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt*, &c. And humble *thankſgiving* at the holy Euchariſt for the benefits of the New Teſtament there tendred, the love of Chriſt in his ſufferings here remembred, and for the means of Communion with the Father and the

Anſ. to Admonit. Tr. 15. c. 1. div. 11. Son in this Ordinance encluded, with reflexion on our own guilt, pollution, and infirmity; is a *fit exerciſe* for this Ordinance. And upon this conſideration Biſhop *Whitgift* declared, *the kneeling geſture to be very meet* for the receiving this Sacrament.

3. But againſt the lawfulneſs of this geſture, divers things are objected. 1. That Kneeling is no *Table geſture as ſitting is*, nor doth it ſo properly expreſs our *fellowſhip* with Chriſt, and the honour and priviledge of Communion with him as *Coheirs*. *Anſ.* 1. As the Lords Supper is no common Feaſt, but a *Heavenly Banquet* prepared by Jeſus Chriſt, which principally conſiſteth of *ſpiritual graces* and benefits, and Communion with Chriſt, ſignified by and tendred under the outward Elements; ſo the adminiſtration and participation of this great Ordinance, ought not to be guided by the Rules of *Common Table fellowſhip*, but by more religious conſiderations. At other Tables the attendants are in office *inferiour* to the gueſts; but in the inſtitution of this Ordinance he who was *Lord and greateſt*, was among them as *one who ſerved*, and all after adminiſtrations of that Ordinance muſt be performed by the *ſpecial Officers* of Chriſts Church, be-

Rutherf. Divine Right of Ch. Gov. p. 196.

cauſe

cauſe the *Conſecration* of the Elements encluded the power of the Keys and a ſolemn benediction. Nor may this Communion be lawfully taken *ſeparately* of every ſingle Family, or by any ſingle perſon as other Suppers may be; and whereas men having the *head covered*, is an ordinary poſture at other Tables; to aſſert, that *men ought to have their Hats on at the Holy Communion*, was juſtly condemned, as an errour vented by ſome wild Spirits, in our former times of licentiouſneſs: and yet this cannot be avoided, by thoſe who will aſſert, that the *poſtures of the Lords Supper* ought to be correſpondent to thoſe at *ordinary Tables*. Wherefore this objection though earneſtly inſiſted upon, is built upon an *unſound Foundation*. But when S. *Paul* reproved the abuſes at *Corinth* about their *Agapæ* which attended the Lords Supper, ſaying, *Have ye not Houſes to eat and to drink in?* it was well from thence obſerved by *Zanchy*, that not only *internal but even external reverence ought to be expreſſed at the Holy Sacrament, otherwiſe than at our common Tables, out of reſpect to Chriſt who inſtituted it.* 2. It is acknowledged that the great priviledge of *Communion* with Chriſt, as Members and joint Heirs (which yet is not a Commu-

Gangr. Part. 2. error. 112.

1 *Cor.* 11. 22.

Zanch. Tom. 4. in 2. Præcept. c. 16.

nion of *equality to him*, but ſtill encludeth deriving from him, and *ſubjection* to him as our head and Lord) is encluded in the right partaking of this Ordinance; and is ſufficently ſignified by the *Ordinance it ſelf* in whatſoever fit and becoming geſture it be adminiſtred. And in all *Chriſtian ſervices* in which we have acceſs to God by the mediation of his Son, Chriſtians enjoy ſome conſiderable degree of *Communion with God* as his Children, which is an high priviledge; but ſtill they are his *Servants and Creatures* and muſt humble themſelves before him, and *kneeling* is ſtill a fit and proper geſture for *Prayer*, and therefore ſo it may be at the *Communion*.

4. *Obj.* 2. But it is more generally by many amongſt us objected, that kneeling at this Sacrament is contrary to the *example and practice of Chriſt* and his Apoſtles, who *ſate* at the inſtitution of the Lords Supper. *Anſ.* 1. There is no *certainty* concerning the *geſture* uſed by Chriſt and his Apoſtles at the Lords Supper. There are ſome good Writers both ancient and Modern, who ſpeak either *variouſly* or *doubtfully*, concerning his geſture at the Paſsover; but I think it ſufficiently evident, eſpecially from S. *Luke* 22. *v.* 14, 15. and *John* 21. 20. that he did

did eat the Paſsover with his Diſciples *in a diſcumbing geſture* (which geſture becauſe it is wholly out of uſe with us, is expreſſed in our Engliſh Tranſlation by *ſitting*, becauſe it was a Table geſture.) Now they who urge this Objection take for granted, becauſe the Lords Supper was inſtituted before the Paſchal Solemnities were *fully ended*, that our Saviour continued all that time in the ſame geſture; againſt the *certainty*, yea or *probability* of which, I alledge three things. 1. That it was the ordinary Cuſtom of the Jews, to *change their geſture* during the continuance of the *Paſchal Feaſt*. At the beginning of their Feaſt, they did *diſcumb* and ſo continued till they had eaten the Cake of Unleavened Bread, and drunk the two former Cups of Wine, as both the *Talmud* and *Buxtorf* do relate; but at the time of the two latter Cups of Wine, and at the eating their bitter Herbs the ſame geſture was not *required*, *nor uſed*, as the *Talmud* in *Berachoth*, and *Peſachin* doth expreſs; and here *Buxtorf* ſaith, *reclinati non comedunt*. 2. That the Jews who in their ſolemn Feaſts did eat diſcumbing, yet in their *giving thanks* before thoſe Feaſts, they were (as *Philo* relateth) in a *ſtanding geſture*, with their eyes and hands liſted up towards Heaven; and

V. Hor. Hebr. in Mat. 26. 20.

Buxt. Synag. Judaic. c. 13.

Phil. de Vit. Contemp.

therefore it is no way probable, that Chriſt and his Apoſtles ſhould continue in their *Table geſture*, (which this objection muſt ſuppoſe) at the *bleſſing the Holy Supper*, which is an higher Ordinance than the Paſsover was, becauſe this would be very unſuitable to ſo great a ſolemnity. 3. That there appeareth no *footſteps* of any Cuſtom of the Primitive Church, of receiving the Lords Supper either *ſitting* or *diſcumbing*, (of which the following Section will give ſome further account.)

5. *Anſ.* 2. There is no *obligation of duty* upon the Chriſtian Church, to keep to that geſture in the Lords Supper, which was uſed by Chriſt and his Apoſtles, though it could be evidently diſcovered: becauſe 1. Chriſt hath given no *command* concerning the geſture, and *St. Paul* when he telleth his *Corinthians*, what he had *received from the Lord and delivered unto them* concerning this *Holy Sacrament*, maketh no mention at all therein of any *geſture*. 1 *Cor.* 11. 23, 24, 25. Biſhop *Jewel* therefore well aſſerteth, that *Chriſt* ſaid not, *Do this after Supper, or ſitting, or being ſo many together, neither did the Apoſtles ever ſo underſtand him.* 2. *Chriſt* and his Apoſtles obſerved that *Paſsover-geſture* which was uſually received among the

Reply to Hard. Art. 2.

the Jews though it was different from the geſture at its firſt inſtitution; of which I have diſcourſed ſomewhat in a former Chapter. 3. Other *circumſtances of like nature* attendant upon the inſtitution of the Lords Supper, are generally acknowledged to be of no neceſſary obligation unto Chriſtians in after times. Biſhop *Saunderſon* noteth that whereas thoſe four laſt predicaments, *ubi, quando, ſitus, habitus*; *where, when, the geſture and the habit*, are of a like nature; it is generally acknowledged that we are not obliged to make uſe of a *like place* for the celebrating the Lords Supper, (an upper room) nor the *ſame time*, (at night at the end of Supper) nor of the *ſame habit*, (a ſeemleſs Coat woven throughout) but *only the geſture is urged as neceſſary*, for which there can be no more reaſon than for the other; yea though there be more *uncertainty* concerning the geſture, than concerning any of the other three.

Ch. 1. Sect. 2. n. 3.

De Oblig. Conſc. Prael. 3. Sect. 16. &c.

6. *Anſ.* 3. There is no reaſon at all to conclude that Chriſt and his Apoſtles *ſate* at this inſtitution. Now though I know no evidence againſt our Saviour his *uſing a geſture of Prayer and Worſhip* at the time of celebrating the Lords Supper; which is the more probable, becauſe ſuch was the

the general practice of the ancient Primitive Churches, I ſhall for the preſent ſuppoſe that he uſed the ſame geſture at the Lords Supper, and at the Paſsover; yet then I muſt obſerve, 1. That this *diſcumbing geſture* was vaſtly different from ſitting. 2. That if this ſuppoſed geſture uſed at the inſtitution was *eſſential or of neceſſity* to the Sacrament, they who undertake to change *diſcumbing* into *ſitting*, upon pretence that that is the ordinary Table geſture in theſe Countries, muſt undertake to aſſert that the *introducing new Cuſtoms* among men, may have power to alter the neceſſary and *eſſential duties* of Gods Ordinances; which is a poſition deſtructive to Religion and Chriſtianity; for if any Company of men ſhould enure themſelves to a diet wherein they ordinarily allow themſelves neither *Bread nor Wine*, this will in no wiſe warrant their undertaking to celebrate this Sacrament in any *other Elements*, where theſe Elements may be as eaſily had and uſed, as men may compoſe themſelves to a *reclining or diſcumbing geſture*.

7. Wherefore he who urgeth the *neceſſity of any geſture* at this Sacrament upon pretence that it was uſed by Chriſt and his Apoſtles, doth declare that for a duty

duty which is none; and pretendeth to *follow* their example where probably he may be *miſtaken* in it; but he who conformeth to that geſture which is by *authority eſtabliſhed*, though it were certainly different from the geſture at the inſtitution, (which yet ſome have conjectured to have been a *kneeling geſture*) doth manifeſtly *follow the example* of Chriſt and his Apoſtles, who did embrace that *Paſſover geſture* which was at that time of *common practice* among the Jews, but could not be pretended to be the geſture at the firſt celebration thereof. *Dr. Kellet. Tricen. l. 3. c. 5. Sect. 3. 6. Ch. 7. Sect. 1.*

SECT. IV.

Of the Communion geſture obſerved in the Chriſtian Church, both in the purer and the more degenerate times thereof.

1. *Obj.* 3. It is urged by ſome *Non-Conformiſts*, that the Univerſal Church in the Primitive times uſed *ſitting and not kneeling*; and that the holy Communion was then received *ſitting*, is thought not improbable by ſome others. Now though this if it were true, would not prove our geſture *unlawful*, becauſe the Church is not bound to obſerve always the ſame *indifferent* *Holy Table Ch. 5. p. 134.* *Of Relig. Aſſemb. c. 4.*

indifferent rites and geſtures: for though Chriſt, and his Apoſtles after his Aſcenſion, *ſate when they taught the people, Act.* 16. 13. all Miniſters are not thereby obliged to the ſame geſture. Yet I further aſſert. 1. There is no evidence that ever the Primitive Church uſed any *ordinary Table geſture*, at the receiving the Lords Supper; but conſiderable proof may be made of the contrary. We read indeed of the *ſeats for the Biſhop and Presbyters* in the Chriſtian Aſſemblies; but as this cannot reſpect the *whole Aſſembly*, ſo it giveth no more evidence of *their geſture at the Communion*, than the ſame thing with us doth of our geſture. That place of *Tertullian* which *Rhenanus* ſometime underſtood of the Euchariſt, (*Non prius diſcumbitur quam oratio ad Deum prægu-ſtetur, &c.* that they do not *diſcumb, or uſe the reclining geſture till they have firſt prayed*) doth manifeſtly refer to their *love-feaſt only*, whereas it followeth in *Tertullian*, *they eat as much as ſatisfieth hunger*, and *drink as much as becometh ſober perſons*. When *Cyprian* writeth to *Cornelius*, that he would not *allow the Letters of the* Novatian *party to be read, conſidentibus ſacerdotibus Dei, & altari poſito, while the Prieſts of God were ſate together, and the Altar prepared*; he doth not

Apol. c. 39.

V. Pamel. ibid.

Cyp. Ep. 42.

not expreſs their *uſual geſture at the Lords Table*, but the manner of their holding Synods, as may be collected from that and the foregoing Epiſtle. And it is well obſerved by *Petitus*, that the Canons and practice of the ancient Church, required their *annual Synods* to aſſemble upon the *ſtationary days*, at the cloſe of which ſtations they always received the *Communion*. *Ep.* 41. *Petit. Var. Lect. l.* 3. *c.* 4.

2. But that the Primitive geſture at the Communion was not ſuch as they uſed at their *ordinary Tables*, may be partly collected from *Tertullian*, who relating and refelling the *impudent ſlander* of the Gentiles occaſioned as *Euſebius* ſaith by the Gnoſticks, firſt againſt the *Euchariſt*, and then againſt the *Love Feaſts*, (as is manifeſt by comparing this with *Cap.* 7. and with *Minucius Felix*) he proceedeth from the former to the latter ſaying, *interea diſcumbens, &c.* or *then falling to a Table geſture, &c.* which ſheweth, that ſuch a geſture was uſed at their *Love Feaſts*, but not at the *holy Communion*. This is alſo expreſſed by *Juſtin Martyr*, who declareth that after the end of their *Sermon or Exhortation, they all riſe up and give thanks, and receive the holy Sacrament:* which words ſhew that though they *ſate* before at the time of the Ser- *Tertul. Apol. c.* 8. *Euſ. Hiſt. Eccl. l.* 4. *c.* 7. *Minuc. Fel. edit. Oxon. p.* 26, 98, *&c.* *Juſt. Mart. Ap.* 2.

mon,

mon, they *changed that geſture* on purpoſe, when they came to attend the receiving the holy Communion.

3. I aſſert. 2. The Primitive Church did practiſe and require at the receiving the Communion, ſuch a geſture as was uſual to *expreſs humility and reverence*, and *worſhip* towards God. *Cyrill* directeth the Communicant to take the Cup, κύψαν τῷ τρόπῳ προσκυνήσεως καὶ σεβάσματος *bowing down after the manner of worſhipping and adoring*. S. *Chryſoſtome* required more *worſhip and reverence* to be expreſſed towards Chriſt at the *receiving the Sacrament*, than the wiſe men of the Eaſt ſhewed to him, when they *fell down* and *worſhipped* him with fear and trembling. A humble frame and behaviour was thought ſo agreeable to this Ordinance by *Origen*, (if that Homily be his and not ſome other ancient Writers) that he exhorteth the Communicant to imitate the humility of the *Centurion*, who ſaid, *Lord I am not worthy that thou ſhouldſt come under my roof*. And that the Chriſtians uſually expreſſed adoration at the receiving this Sacrament, is manifeſt from S. *Auguſtines*, *Nemo manducat niſi prius adoraverit*, and from other like expreſſions both of his and S. *Ambroſes*.

Syr. Hieroſ. Cat. Myſt. 5.

Chryſ. Hom. 24. *in* 1 *Cor.* μετὰ φόβου καὶ τρόμου προσεκύνησαν.

Orig. in Diverſ. Hom. 5.

Aug. in Pſ. 98. *Ep.* 120. *c.* 27. *Amb. de Sp. Sanc. l.* 3. *c.* 12.

4. Now whereas the twentieth Canon of

of *Nice*, according to a more ancient Custom, enjoined all Prayers upon the Lords days, and from *Easter* to *Whitsunday*, to be performed in a *standing gesture*; which S. *Augustin* saith was the general practice upon those days at the *Eucharistical or Communion Prayers*: it is not to be doubted but that their gesture of reverence, used upon those days at this Sacrament, was a *standing gesture*: especially since *Tertullian* earnestly declareth against the use of a *sitting posture in adoration*, as being irreverent; and also acquainteth us that it was not allowed in those times *de geniculis adorare, to perform any adoration kneeling upon the Lords days*. Wherefore when *Dionysius* of *Alexandria* speaketh of a Communicant in his Church, τραπέζῃ παραστάντα, we may properly render it *standing at the Lords Table*, and the testimony of *Justin Martyr* above produced, giveth a very probable *intimation* of the same gesture. But when as the ancient Churches had two *stationary days* in a Week (that is, the fourth and sixth days; with which the seventh day was also joined at *Cæsarea*, as is manifest from S. *Basil*) upon which the holy Communion was administred; it is probable, that as upon those days they *prayed kneeling*, so they did in the same gesture receive

Aug. Ep. 119. c. 15.

Tertul. de Orat. c. 12.

De Cor. Milit. c. 3.

Eus. Hist. Eccl. l. 7. c. 9.

Basil. Ep. ad Cæsariam.

ceive this Sacrament, in attendance upon which they thought an humble geſture of adoration to be very ſuitable; this Sacrament being accounted by them φρικτὰ μυστήρια *the dreadful Myſteries.*

Albaſp. Obſ. l. 1. Obſ. 15. 5. Indeed *Albaſpinus* undertaketh to aſſert, without any proof, that the chief reaſon why anciently *they ſtood in their Prayers upon the Lords days and the Penteco ſt, was becauſe upon thoſe days they received the Holy Communion, and it was requiſite they ſhould uſe none other than a geſture of Joy upon that day*, in which they communicated in that Sacrament. But beſides the improbability of ſuppoſing *daily Communions* (where we have no teſtimony thereof) from *Eaſter* to *Whitſunday*, this obſervation is very plainly contradicted by *Albaſpinus* himſelf in his very next obſervation, where he declareth that the Euchariſt was conſtantly celebrated upon the *ſtationary days*, and yet upon thoſe days he yielded that the ancient Chriſtians did *pray kneeling*: and this his conjecture is alſo contrary to what is aſſerted by the ſixth *general Council*, by *Zonaras and Balſamon*, upon the twentieth Council of *Nice*, and by *S. Hierom*, *Auſtin*, *Baſil*, and other Fathers, who unanimouſly aſſert that their *joyfulneſs* to the wonder of the Gentiles, for the Reſurrection

Obſ. 16.

Conc. Trul. c. 90.

Hieron. Procem. in lib. 1. Com. in Eph.

ſurrection of Chriſt; and their profeſſing themſelves to be riſen with him, and to expect reſurrection by him, was the cauſe of their ſtanding geſture at thoſe times in their Religious Prayers. But that the moſt *humble geſture* was not thought inconſiſtent with the Euchariſt may appear, beſides the teſtimonies above produced, from what *Gregory Nazianzen* relateth of his Siſter *Gorgonia* who privately fell down *proſtrate* before the Altar with the Sacrament in her hand. *Gr. Nazianz. Orat in Gorgon.*

6. Wherefore kneeling at the holy Sacrament, or receiving it in a geſture of *Prayer and Religious Worſhip* unto God, was no way diſallowed as *unlawful* by the Primitive Church; but our practice herein, is but a building upon their Foundations who themſelves uſed a geſture of *Adoration*, or the ſame geſture with that of *Prayer*.

7. *Obj.* 4. Kneeling is a geſture which hath been *groſly abuſed* by the Papiſts, in *worſhipping the hoſt*, according to their Doctrine of Tranſubſtantiation, and to that end it was enjoined by *Honorius the third*. *Anſ.* 1. No ſinful uſe of any geſture, though it be in the moſt *manifeſt Idolatry*, doth render that geſture unlawful in Religious ſervice to God, as was ſhewed in the former Chapter. Though

the *Iſraelites ſate down to eat and drink*, when they had offered Sacrifices to the golden Calf, *Ex.* 32. 6. it was ſtill allowable in the days of *Samuel to ſit down to feaſt* upon the Sacrifices of God, 1 *Sam.* 9. 13, 22. And though the *diſcumbing or reclining geſture*, was anciently uſed in Idolatrous Feaſts (*Amos* 2. 8. *Ezek.* 23. 41) and ſo continued in ſome places very common till the times of Chriſt, (being deſigned by κατακεῖσθαι to *ſit*, or rather *diſcumb* in the idols Temple, 1 *Cor.* 8. 10.) and for ſome hundred years after as appears from the Council of *Ancyra*, yet Chriſt himſelf made *uſe of this geſture* at the Jewiſh Paſsover, according to the Cuſtom and Canons of the Jewiſh Church.

Conc. Ancyr. Can. 5.

8. *Anſw.* 2. Though it it be true that many Papiſts (but not all) do receive and adore the Hoſt *kneeling*; yet the Decree of *Honorius* ſo oft inſiſted upon, is herein *miſtaken and miſapplyed*. That Decree commandeth that the people *cum elevatur hoſtia ſalutaris ſe reverenter inclinet, idem faciens cum eam deferat Presbyter ad infirmum*, which words ſpeak not the geſture of communicating, or at the time of receiving the Sacrament; but only concerns their behaviour as ſpectators, when the Hoſt immediately after the Conſecration

Decret. Greg. Lib. 3. *Tit.* 41. *c.* 10.

Conſecration is elevated, or when it is carried abroad to the ſick. And though the *old Gloſs* ſuppoſeth that kneeling was thereby at ſuch times enjoined, which the practice of many in that Communion cannot admit; *Eſpencæus* a more learned man than the Author of the Gloſs, accounteth that Decree rather to *prohibit kneeling*, and to direct (as the words *ſe reverenter inclinet*, may import) a *ſtanding geſture* with expreſſion of reverence. And *Eſpencæus* telleth us in the ſame place, that in 1555. the *kneeling geſture* had not obtained in the Church of *Lyons*, and that when ſome endeavoured to obtrude it upon that *Metropolis*, a ſtop was put to their proceeding by the Royal Authority: and in the ſame place in that Book, purpoſely written for the *adoration of the Sacrament*, he declareth that it is not much material in what geſture it is performed, whether *ſitting, ſtanding, lying, or kneeling.*

Eſpencæus De Adorat. Euch. l. 2. c. 16.

9. *Anſ.* 3. They who will lay aſide all geſtures *groſly abuſed*, muſt upon the ſame account reject all thoſe, which are in this Sacrament ordinarily received in the Proteſtant Churches, both *ſtanding and ſitting*, as well as kneeling. That ſtanding was a geſture *uſed in the Romiſh adoration* of the Hoſt, by many of the ordinary

Sacr. Cerem. lib. 1. Sect. 2. Cap. 1. f. 22. ſort of Papiſts is evident from *Eſpencæus* now cited. And if he who is elected *Pope* be not Biſhop or Prieſt; at his Prieſtly Ordination he *receiveth the Sacrament ſtanding*; for then as their Book of Ceremonies informs us, *Ordinator communicat electo ſtanti in ipſo cornu, de corpore & ſanguine Chriſti*; and the ſame geſture is uſed by him at his *Epiſcopal ordination*, *Communionem ſumet ſub utraq; ſpecie ſtans &c.* And as this is the geſture of the Pope in that great ſolemnity of the Popes being inveſted with his *Papal dignity*, ſo upon the *great Maſs* upon *Chriſtmas day*, if the Pope himſelf celebrate the Maſs, the Deacon who attendeth upon him receiveth it at the Popes hand in a *ſtanding geſture*, *Diaconus ſtans, inclinato capite ex ejus manibus de Corpore Chriſti communicat, --- Calamo ſtans ſanguinis partem ſugit*; and in the ſame geſture the conficient Prieſt uſually receiveth.

Ibid. c. 2. f. 28.

Ibid. Lib. 2. Sect. 1. Cap. 14. Sacerdotal. Par. 1. Tract. 4. c. 35.

10. But becauſe *ſitting* is moſt contended for amongſt us, I ſhall obſerve that this hath been many ways alſo groſly *abuſed*. Firſt it was the ordinary geſture of *worſhip* in the *Romiſh Pagan Idolatry*. The ancient laws of their Pagan worſhip required, *ut adoraturi ſedeant*, which as *Plutarch* affirmeth, was appointed by *Numa Pompilius*; and *Tertullian* informeth us that

Plut. in Numa.

that at their Gentile ſolemnities even in his time, they *worſhipped their images ſitting, adoratis ſigillaribus ſuis reſidendo.* *Tertul. de Orat. c. 1.*

11. And in the Romiſh Church, it is by ſome aſſerted, and appeareth very probable, that the *Pope himſelf* at ſome ſolemnities *receiveth the Euchariſt ſitting.* When the Emperour receiveth his Coronation, their Maſter of Ceremonies telleth us, that at the time of Maſs, the Pope with the Emperour following him in the place of a Sub-Deacon goeth to the Altar, whence *Pontifex ad ſedem eminentem communicaturus revertitur*, the Pope (who at that time doth himſelf celebrate) goeth to his ſeat of eminency therein to receive the Communion. And a book called *the Quench-Coal*, written many years ſince as an anſwer to Dr. *Heyling's Coal from the Altar*, produceth this teſtimony from *William Thomas* in his Hiſtory of *Italy*, who declareth himſelf an eye witneſs thereof in the year 1547. that *the Altar in the Cathedral Church of* Rome, *even in the time of Maſs when the Pope received the Sacrament, was ſtanding in the midſt of the Quire, and the Pope ſitting in a Chair of State about it.* And *Didoclavius* telleth us, (which is the only inſtance he produceth out of any Hiſtory for *ſitting at the Sacrament*, and he may be miſta- *Sacr. Cerem. l. 1. Sect. 5. Cap. 3. V. Durand. Rat. l. 4. c. 54. n. 4. 5. Quench Coal p. 12.*

ken in that) that the *Benedictine Monks* receive the Sacrament *ſitting* upon the *Thurſday* before *Eaſter*: and yet I ſuppoſe (if his obſervation be true) he will not imagine that they receive it with *leſs adoration of the Hoſt*, than other Papiſts do.

Altar. Damaſc. c. 10.

12. And *ſitting at the Sacrament* hath yet been much more abuſed by the *Arians in Poland* (as their Synods called the *Socinians*) who as denying the Divinity of Chriſt, and not giving due reverence to him, were the *firſt Authors* known to thoſe Churches of *this ſitting geſture*: upon which account the Churches both of the *Bohemian*, *Auguſtan* and *Helvetick* Confeſſions, reſiding in *Poland* and *Lithuania*, diſclaimed the uſe of that geſture (though they eſteemed it *lawful in it ſelf*) as being upon this occaſion *ſcandalous*. Wherefore to aſſert that every geſture groſly abuſed by others ought to be utterly relinquiſhed, is not only contrary to *truth*, and to the practice of *the Church of England*; but is herein oppoſite to the uſe of all the *reformed Churches*, and it would make *void* Chriſts *inſtitution* of the Sacrament, by admitting no geſture to be lawful to communicate therein.

In Synodis Cracovienſ. Petricovienſ. Wlodiſlav. & Torunienſ. in Corp. Confeſſionum.

13. Yet that we may diſcern the various working of mens minds, in their arguments againſt this *kneeling geſture*, and how

how copiouſly every thing affordeth matter to them who will take up with any thing; we may obſerve, that as *kneeling* is ſometimes *diſliked* as having been Idolatrouſly abuſed, ſo *ſitting* is ſometimes *pleaded for*, as being the geſture practiſed and allowed by Chriſt, becauſe it was the geſture (ſay they) in the *Idols Temple*. Thus Mr. *Rutherford* in theſe ſtrange expreſſions, undertaketh to prove that Chriſt did ſit at the Lords Supper, *becauſe ſitting at the Idols Table*, 1 Cor. 8. 10. *declareth that in Religious Feaſts ſitting was ordinary, and a ſign indicant of honouring the ſpiritual Lord of the Banquet, and a religious Communion with the Lord of the Feaſt was hence ſignified.* *Div. Right of Ch. Gov. Ch. 1. Q. 1. p. 195.*

14. Another thing urged againſt *kneeling* at the Sacrament, which of all others is moſt ſtrange and uncharitable, is this, that *kneeling* at the Sacrament is *Idolatry*, and is parallel with worſhipping God by *an Image*, and even with the *Pagan Idolatry it ſelf*, upon this ground, becauſe *to kneel before any Creature as a memorative object of God, though there be no intention of giving divine adoration to that Creature, is Idolatry*, in the opinion of ſome men. *Obj. 5. Rutherf. Divine Right of Ch. Gover. Ch. 1. Qu. 5. Sect. 1, 3. Altar. Damaſc. c. 10. p. 801.*

15. *Anſ.* 1. This raſh poſition tendeth to make the Jews worſhipping God be-

fore the *Ark or mercy Seat*, and before *the Temple* at *Jeruſalem*, or the *Tabernacle* in the Wilderneſs, to have been equally Idolatrous with the ſerving *Jeroboams Calves*, or worſhipping *Baal*; which was ſo far from that great ſin, that it was then a *neceſſary duty of Religion.* And the cauſe of this groſs miſtake, is the want of conſidering the vaſt difference, of *worſhipping a falſe God*; or making uſe of a *memorative object* to repreſent the *likeneſs of the divine being*, which is contrary to his nature, and forbidden by his Precepts; and of uſing ſuch a *memorative object* in worſhip, as is to be a *memorial of the Covenant and grace of God* and Chriſt, and his Communion with us, being to that end *appointed* and *inſtituted* as a remembrance of him. If theſe things be not accounted vaſtly different, it muſt be concluded not very conſiderable, whether we do things *appointed* of God or *forbidden* of him; and things *agreeable* to the nature of God or *oppoſite* thereto. And beſides this to worſhip God alone, making uſe of ſuch *memorative objects* as an help thereto, which do properly call to our minds Gods mighty works, and glorious Attributes, is far from being either *Idolatrous*, or *blameable.* If a pious man taking a view of the mighty works of Gods

C creation,

Creation, or any part thereof, ſhould upon this ſight be put in mind of the power and wiſdom of their Creator, and thence ſhould *glorifie*, *admire*, and worſhip, not the *Creature but God* alone; ſuch actions are not evil, but devout and religious.

16. 2. This aſſertion is of ſo dangerous conſequence, as to diſown this holy Sacrament, from being an *Ordinance of Chriſtian worſhip*, and to hinder the principal duties therein to be performed. For it is directly contrary to the duties of this Sacrament, to condemn the *worſhipping of Chriſt* as ſinful, at the view of this *memorial* of Chriſts Death in this Sacrament; when Chriſtians here ought to magnifie his grace, mercy, and love, to glorifie him for the wonderful Salvation and Atonement effected by his Death, to implore his grace and ſpirit, with all the bleſſings and benefits of the New Teſtament, to acknowledge him, and ſubmit to him, as our only Soveraign Lord, with other ſuch like, which are proper actions of our *worſhipping* and inwardly *adoring* him. And it is unreaſonable as well as uncharitable, where theſe *inward acts* of Religion are neceſſary and a duty, to condemn the *outward expreſſion* thereof, as either Idolatrous, or any way ſinful, being

being directed to him who is Lord both of our Souls and Bodies.

17. And though ſome mens fierceneſs carrieth them very far, yet if we conſult the judgment of the Proteſtant Churches, who all admit *an uniform geſture* in their ſeveral Churches; not only the *Lutheran Churches* make uſe of *kneeling* at the Communion, as an expreſſion and excitement of devotion, but the *Bohemian* Church which alſo uſed kneeling, declareth that *this geſture being piouſly received, devotionem ipſam & in conſpectu Dei humilitatem, adeoq; gaudium cum tremore auget; encreaſeth devoutneſs of mind, humility in the ſight of God, and awful rejoycing.* Thoſe of the *Helvetick* Confeſſion in *Poland*, who themſelves uſed *ſtanding*, did approve of kneeling in the Poliſh Synods above-mentioned, nor hath it ever been condemned by any Proteſtant Church abroad: but is particularly approved and well allowed of all by divers of the moſt eminent Miniſters of the Reformed Churches, as hath been manifeſted by Mr. *Durel*. *Zanchy* declareth, that there is *no doubt but that they act holily, and according to the will of God, who come to handle and partake of the holy Sacrament, with external reverence alſo.* And *Hoſpinian* declareth, that

Ratio Diſcipl. Cap. 3. Sect. 4.

Zanch. in Sec. prec. c. 17.

that the Sacraments ought to be handled *with great Religion and reverence, according to the Cuſtom of every Church, with a comely habit, modeſt behaviour, ſoberly and devoutly, with the head uncovered, and with bended knees.*

Hoſpin. Hiſt. Sacram. l. 5. c. 8.

CHAP.

CHAP. IV.

Of other particular Rites appointed in the Church of England.

SECT. I.

Of the Surpleſs.

1. A Decent *habit* in the ſervice of God is generally allowed to be expedient, and *Bucer* obſerved, that whether men will or no, they muſt acknowledge that the *diſtinct Garments and Ornaments of Magiſtrates, doth procure a ſingular reſpect to their Magiſtracy.* And a decent habit uſed by Miniſters in the worſhip of God, doth expreſs a *reverent eſteem of the ſervice of God*, and promoteth a due reſpect to them and their Miniſtration, with men of unprejudiced minds. Upon which account a particular comely *attire* for the *Levites* under the Law, (as hath been above ſhewed) and for Chriſtian Miniſters both in the *Primitive* and *reformed* Churches, was ordered and appointed by Eccleſiaſtical Authority: and to this end with us as with many other Churches ancient and modern

Ch. 1. Sect. 8.

modern reformed the uſe of the *Surpleſs* is received, the decency of which is to be conſidered.

2. As the ſervice of God in Religious miniſtrations is excellent and honourable, ſo the general ſenſe of a great part of the World, both Jews and Gentiles, have accounted *white garments* to be honourable and comely, and they are alſo approved as ſuch by the wiſdom of God himſelf, in the deſcription of the moſt excellent perſons and things. The glorious attire of the *Lambs Wife*, and ſome of the *Apocalyptick Angels*, is expreſſed by their being *arrayed in white linen*, *Rev.* 19. 8. *Chap.* 15. 6. the glorious ſtate of the whole *Church of God*, and its *Members*, and of the *Elders* before the Throne, is ſignified by their being cloathed in white raiment, *Rev.* 7. 9. *Chap.* 3, 4, 18. *Chap.* 4. 4. and the appearance of *Angels*, the *Tranſfiguration* of Chriſt, and the viſion of the *glory of God*, are repreſented in white garments, *Mark* 16. 5. *Act.* 1. 10. *Mark* 9. 3. *Dan.* 7. 9. and the Holy Ghoſt would certainly not make uſe of things *indecent and unſeemly*, as repreſentations of ſuch great and glorious excellencies. And therefore they who will condemn or *deride* a veſture of white linen, as being in it ſelf *uncomely*, muſt firſt undertake

Baron. An. 44. n. 88. *Caſaub. Exercit.* 16. n. 73. *Selden. de Synedr. l.* 1. c. 3.

Zanch. in 2. Precept. c. 16. take to give evidence, that they have better judgments concerning what is *decent* in the Church, than the *reſt of the World* have, or than *he* hath *who gave the being* both to the World and to the Church. And it hath been acknowledged by Proteſtant Writers of good note, that the uſe of white linen hath hereby this ſpecial *advantage*, that from the natural ſimplicity of the Colour, the ſpecial conſideration of white linen above expreſſed, and the uſe of theſe expreſſions in Scripture, it may aptly direct us to the *meditation* and conſideration of *purity*.

P. Martyr. Ep. ad Hoop.

Chap. 2. Sect. 1, n. 1.

3. Yet becauſe it muſt be acknowledged, that things in themſelves otherwiſe unblamable, may become *unlawful* when they are made uſe of upon evil principles, or in any evil way, or to bad ends and purpoſes; and whereas the uſe of the Surpleſs is charged by ſome with *Judaizing*, and by others with too much compliance with the *degenerate ſtate* of the Chriſtian Church under Popery, I ſhall take theſe things into conſideration.

4. Though ſuch things as have a *natural comelineſs* or conveniency, do not become unlawful to Chriſtians at all times, becauſe they were made uſe of or injoyned in the Law of *Moſes*, as hath been mani-

manifeſted; yet I further obſerve, that the Surpleſs was no *Aaronical garment*, as hath been ordinarily ſuppoſed and granted. Among the high Prieſts garments, his *Ephod* which was made of blue, Purple, Scarlet, and fine twined linen, and *his Robe* which was all of blue, can have no affinity with the Surpleſs, neither of them being white linen, and both of them of a different ſhape, and his *linen Breeches, Bonnet, Mitre, and Girdle* bear not the leaſt reſemblance thereto: it remaineth therefore that none other of their garments can be like to our Surpleſs, unleſs either the *Coat of the high Prieſt*, or the *Coats of the inferiour Prieſts*, (which are ſometimes called *Ephods*) ſhould agree thereto. The *high Prieſts Coat* was ordinarily an *under-garment*, worn next to his ſkin, upon which he put on his Robe, Ephod, and other attire, as may be collected from *Moſes* his conſecration of *Aaron*, *Lev.* 8. 7, 8. and is plainly expreſſed by *Joſephus*, who was himſelf a Prieſt, and at *Jeruſalem*, whilſt this attire was yet worn. *Ch.* 1. *Sect.* 1. *Joſep. Ant. l.* 3. *c.* 8.

5. But it muſt be owned, that upon the day of *atonement*, which was the tenth day of the ſeventh month, the high Prieſt went into the Holy of Holies in a *linen Coat*, without his other *ordinary Prieſtly*

Philo de Somn. *Prieſtly garments*, as is affirmed by *Philo Judæus* (who alſo ſaith that this was a *white Coat*, though others as well as our *Engliſh* Tranſlators in *Exod.* 28. 39. ſuppoſe it was *embroidered*) by one of the *Chaldee Paraphraſts*, and by divers others both *Jewiſh* Writers and Modern Chriſtians. And though *Cunæus* repreſenteth the contrary opinion which he oppoſeth, as the common opinion of thoſe Chriſtian Writers, which went before him: yet it muſt be acknowledged as manifeſtly true, from *Lev.* 16. 4, 23, 24, 32. that the high Prieſt entred the Holy of Holies without his *glorious attire* only in a *linen Coat with linen Breeches, Mitre, and Girdle*: which might well ſignifie that humble purity was more fit to appear before God, than the greateſt ſplendour and glory; and alſo that when the true atonement ſhould be made by the *Meſſias*, the glory of the *Aaronical* Prieſthood ſhould be done away. And to this purpoſe an obſcure place, probably corrupted in the ordinary Copies of *Joſephus* may with a little tranſpoſition be corrected, to become both plain and agreeable with other Jewiſh Writers if we read them, after his deſcription of the high Prieſts glorious garments, Ἀντὶ δὲ ἀναλάμβανον ἐσθῆτα (ταύτην μὲν οὐκ ἐφόρει τὸν ἄλλον

Targ. Jonath. in Lev. 16. 4. *Salian. An.* 2545. n. 34.

Cun. de Rep. Heb. l. 2. *c.* 1.

Joſep. de Bell. Jud. l. 1. *c.* 16.

ἄλλον χρόνον) ὅποτε εἰσίοι εἰς τὸ ἄδυτον, *that the high Priest did put on a plainer garment than his glorious apparel, when he went into the Holy of Holies, which garment he did not wear at any other time.*

6. Yet if this linen Coat of the high Priest, and those of the other Priests were *white*, as is probable, they were very *different* from the Surpless in three respects. First, in *their fashion*; for those Coats of the *Aaronical* Priests were strait in the arms, and so close to the body, that they admitted of no gathers or folds, as *Josephus* informs us, whence S. *Hierom* and *Alcuinus* compared them to the *Souldiers garments, which were so strictly fitted to their bodies, that they were not hindred in shooting, but strengthned thereby.* And this difference was observed by *Amalarius Fortunatus*, that under the *old Law, the white garment used in the service of God was a strait one, but under the Gospel a loose one:* and common reason will further evidence, that such a loose garment as our Surpless is, was no way convenient for the employment of the *Levitical* Priest in *killing* and offering Sacrifices, *sprinkling* and wringing out blood, and such like actions. Secondly, those *Aaronical* Coats were *girded about them with a girdle*, as both the Scriptures, *Lev.* 8. 13.

Josep. Ant. l. 3. c. 8. Hieron. ad Fabiol. Alcuinus de Div. Offic. c. de singulis vestibus. Amal. de Eccles. Offic. l. 2. c. 18.

Chap. 16. 4. and *Joſephus* in the place above mentioned do expreſs, and the linen girdle for the inferiour Prieſts, was according to *Joſephus* his teſtimony, *wrought with blue, purple, and ſcarlet*, as was alſo that of the high Prieſt for his moſt holy garments, as may be obſerved from *Exod.* 39. 29. Thirdly, thoſe Prieſtly garments under the Law were *no upper ornamental garments*, but thoſe Coats were the only Veſture, upon the upper part of their naked bodies, as were alſo their linen Breeches upon their lower parts, and *no common garments* might be worn with them. Hence they were appointed *to cover their nakedneſs*, *Exod.* 28. 42. and *Philo* ſaith, that in their miniſtrations they were ἀνώμοτες ἐν μόνοις χιτωνίσκοις, *without any other apparel, beſides their Prieſtly Coats*; and the ſame may be inferred from *Lev.* 6. 11. *Ezek.* 44. 17, 18, 19. In all theſe things which are *conſiderable differences*, in the eſteem of thoſe who impartially obſerve them, theſe *Aaronical* Veſtments and the Surpleſs do diſagree: which may therefore evidence, that this garment was not received under Chriſtianity as a thing *Aaronical*, but only as a *decent Veſtment* in Religious Service.

Phil. de Monarch. l. 2.

7. And if we conſider that while the Prieſt-

Prieſthood of *Aaron* was yet ſtanding, though *blue, purple, and fine linnen* were uſed in the high Prieſts Ephod, and in the Vail of the Temple; yet *Mordecai* did lawfully wear a garment of theſe colours of another faſhion from the Ephod, and to a different end, *Eſth.* 8. 15. and that though God appointed *holy linen garments* for the Prieſts, the *Levites* lawfully uſed *other linen garments* not enjoined by the Law, in their praiſing God, which were probably *looſe garments*, and were called *Robes*, 1 *Chron.* 15. 27. this (beſides what is related of other *white garments* uſed by the Prieſts in other joyful Solemnities) is ſufficient to ſhew, that Gods Commandments concerning the *Prieſtly garments* under the Law, did not take away the liberty of uſing *other linen garments* for comelineſs, either in, or out of *Religious ſervice.*

Middoth. c. 5. Sect. 3. Seld. de Synedr. l. 2. c. 11. Sect. 7. ex Solom. ben Virga.

8. Concerning the *Antiquity* of the Chriſtian uſe of this white linen garment, its ordinary uſe at the end of the fourth Century is manifeſt, from the teſtimonies commonly produced from S. *Hierom*, who ſpeaketh of the *Biſhop, Presbyter, Deacon, and the whole Eccleſiaſtical Order, being in a white garment, at the time of ſacred adminiſtrations*; from S. *Chryſoſtom*, warning the Clergy to mind their duty, and

Hier. adv. Pelag. l. 1. c. 9.

Chryſ. Hom. 83. in Mat.

not to think it *enough for them when the Sacraments are adminiſtred, to walk in a white ſhining garment*; and from the Council of *Carthage*, whereby the *Deacon was required at the time of the oblation and leſſon, to wear the white garment.* Now theſe places evidencing that this veſture was then uſed, in very *diſtant parts* of the Chriſtian World, it may be thence in all likelihood concluded, that it had a much more early original. *Walafridus Strabo* relateth, that in the beginning of Chriſtianity, *communi indumento veſtiti miſſas agebant, divine offices were performed in their ordinary apparel*, and the firſt, ſaith he, who ordained the contrary was *Stephen Biſhop of Rome*, which was about 250 years after Chriſt. And if this relation was admitted as true, theſe garments would be thence concluded to have been uſed in the Church above 1400 years ſince; and in matters of *outward ornament*, it is not deſirable that the *firſt times* which were under perſecution, ſhould be made the rule for the *more flouriſhing times* of Chriſtian Religion: for they then had no ſuch *fixed revenues* for the ſupport of the Miniſtry, or *honourable ſtructures* for Church-aſſemblies, as we now enjoy. But indeed the *Decretal Epiſtle* of *Stephen*, upon which

Conc. Carth. 4. Can. 41.

Walaf. Strab. de Reb. Eccleſ. c. 24.

Steph. Epiſt. Decr. ad Hilarium.

Wala-

Walafridus relieth, is a manifeſt forgery, and in the very reading it, it ſmelleth rank of the *Superſtition* of much later times. But that the uſe of a *linen attire* was at that time an enſign of the *Eccleſiaſtical Officers*, ſeemeth the main deſign of that obſervation of *Pontius* the Deacon, concerning S. *Cyprian*; who a little before his Martyrdom being allowed to ſit down in a retiring place, about the Judgment-hall; *Sedile* (ſaith he) *erat fortuito linteo tectum, ut ſubictu paſſionis Epiſcopatus honore frueretur*; *The ſeat was caſually covered with linen, ſo that upon the ſtroke of his paſſion he enjoyed the Epiſcopal honour.* And if we further conſider what probable evidence hath been above given, that white garments were uſed both in the *Jewiſh Synagogues*, and their other ſolemn Services, this maketh it appear probable, that they were of *very ancient uſe* under Chriſtianity, upon the account of *Decency*.

Pontius Diac. in Vit. Cypr.

9. And ſince the degeneracy of the *Romiſh Church*, though they ſtill uſe the *Surpleſs*, it is none of their proper *Maſſing garments*, being never worn by the *Prieſt who conſecrateth*, (or their conficient Prieſt) at the Maſs, as is manifeſt from *Durandus*, *Durantus*, and the Roman Miſſal in its *præparatio ad Maſſam*. But

Durand. Ration. l. 3. c. 1. &c. Durant. de Rit. l. 2. c. 9.

his Maſſing attire is made up of theſe ſix Veſtments, according to their ordinary deſcription, the *Amictus*, *Alba*, *cingulum*, *ſtola*, *manipulus* and *caſula*, all which are far different from the Surpleſs: and theſe ſix garments only are accounted the *holy garments* uſed by their Prieſts, and all of them have their *particular Conſecrations*, as the Surpleſs even in the Romiſh Church hath not; and therefore this garment hath been far *leſs abuſed* among them, than either *Churches*, *Communion-cloaths*, or other things, which by reaſon of their miniſeſt conveniency or decency, are ordinarily admitted to be of lawful uſe.

Benedict. diverſ. ſec: uſum Sarum.

10. And if any perſons will decry the uſe of ſuch Habits, which have been abuſed as *unlawful and unclean*, let them conſider whither this Spirit will lead them: for they muſt hereby oppoſe S. *Pauls* doctrine of *all things being pure*, and inſtead thereof muſt introduce a far greater diſtinction of things clean and unclean under *Chriſtianity*, than ever was admitted under the *Jewiſh Pedagogie*; ſince almoſt the ſame abuſes may be objected againſt any other kind of *Veſture*, as againſt the uſe of *white Linen*. Some oppoſers of our conformity have averred, that the white garments uſed by the *Gentile* Sacrificers were *white woollen*, and the

Alt. Damaſc. 6. 10. p. 895.

the Romiſh Book of Ceremonies ſaith, that among the peculiar garments of the Pope, *the gown of white woollen* is one. And as the Maſs attire in the Romiſh Church is upon many daies required to be *white*; ſo upon divers other yearly daies, this attire muſt be *red*, upon others *green*, and upon others *violet-coloured*. *Sacr. Cerem. l. 1. Sect. 1. cap. 5. Dur. Ration. l. 3. c. 18.*

And for more particular inſtance, the uſe of *black garments* (which are in themſelves nevertheleſs lawful) may be argued againſt with as much plauſibleneſs from *the Topick of abuſe*, as can be urged againſt the *white*. For that the ancient *Pagan Prieſts* uſed a black habit, and were thence called *Chemarim* (which *Junius* uſually rendreth *atratos*, or thoſe who wear black) is declared by *Buxtorf*; and hath been obſerved from *R. D. Kimchi* on *Zeph.* 1. 4. and is generally acknowledged. But I further obſerve, that among the Papiſts their *anniverſary Solemnities* for the *laſt Pope*, and for all other *deceaſed Popes and Cardinals*, their *Commemoration of all Souls*, and all their particular *Maſſes for the dead* (which are none of the leaſt of their enormities) are required to be performed in a *black attire* only. Yet where all ſuch corruptions are diſclaimed, either ſuch things as *Sacerdotal. Par. 1. Tract. 4. cap. 42.* *Buxt. Lex. Rab.* בָּמַר *Sacerdotal. ibidem* *Sacr. Cerem. l. 2. Sect. 2. cap. 26. 31, 34, 35.*

are in themſelves otherwiſe allowable and expedient, may be lawfully uſed, notwithſtanding the abuſe of others, or elſe men muſt have diſputed themſelves out of Gods Creation, ſince both Heaven and Earth, and all ſorts of Creatures therein, have been *idolatrouſly abuſed*, as is abundantly manifeſt from *Voſſius* his Books, *De Idololatriæ origine & progreſſu.*

11. Wherefore this habit being of *ancient uſe* in the Chriſtian Church, which eſteemed it decent, and being no *Jewiſh attire*; and being ſo far from an attendant upon the Romiſh *Tranſubſtantiation*, and their Sacrifice of the Maſs (as ſome have falſely ſuggeſted) that if it did not reach to the *Apoſtles times* (who in the Arabick Language are oft called *Alhavarin*, which ſome render *albicantes*, others *viri albis induti veſtibus*) it was certainly uſed long before theſe corruptions took place, and while the primitive *purity of doctrine* was retained; and it is a garment which is not appointed, nor allowed to be uſed to *conſecrate the Maſs* therein; and hath alſo eſcaped thoſe *ſuperſtitious Conſecrations*, which have been uſed among them towards Communion-cloaths of linen, and Patins and Chalices or Cups, all which are retained by Proteſtants: there is then no reaſon why its uſe among us

V. D. Hammonds Parap. Rev. 4. 4. Seld. de Syned. l. 3. c. 11. Sect. 3.

us ſhould be condemned. Among the *Proteſtant Churches*, ſome in *Germany* with thoſe in *Denmark* and *Norwey* retain this with other veſtments; divers other Writers and men of Note declare the uſe of this veſtment to be innocent and allowable; others, and among them *Calvin diſlikes* the *heat of contention* againſt the uſe hereof. And though ſome, as the Synod of *Weiſſenburg* in *Tranſilvania*, diſapprove the uſe of the linen garment, as being not a thing of an *indifferent nature*; yet they proceeded upon inſufficient grounds, relying altogether upon theſe miſtakes, that this garment was *Aaronical*, and brought into the Chriſtian Church in the *late and corrupt times* thereof; which miſtakes are ſufficiently diſcovered, and therefore what is built upon them can be of no force, and therefore needs no further anſwer.

Calv. Ep. 117. *& Ep.* 120.

Concord. Confil. Syn. Alb. Julienſ. 1634.

SECT. II.

Of the Sign of the Croſs in the Office for Baptiſm.

1. Among other Ceremonies, the *ſign of the Croſs* (which if rightly underſtood, would appear to be of very good and profitable uſe) hath been moſt oppoſed; and

Mr. Bast. Diſ. of Ceremon. c. 2. v. 52.

and though ſome more modeſtly *doubt* of its lawfulneſs, *ſuſpecting* this rather than any other Rite of our Church to be unlawful, but *not daring to condemn them who uſe it*; others have more raſhly but very falſely charged it, as containing a *wicked and ſuperſtitious inſtitution of a new Sacrament.* The lawfulneſs and uſefulneſs hereof will be beſt vindicated by a *right underſtanding* of its uſe: and becauſe it is received amongſt us as a *laudable Rite of the Primitive Church which we retain* (as the thirtieth Canon declareth) I ſhall firſt give ſome account of the practice of the Primitive Church in the uſe of this ſign, which I think was anciently obſerved for a threefold end and purpoſe.

Admonition.

2. 1. As a *profeſſing ſign*, whereby they teſtified openly their honouring Chriſt crucified, either before them who denied the Chriſtian name, or among themſelves; or as our Canon expreſſeth it, *they hereby made an outward ſhew and profeſſion even to the aſtoniſhment of the Jews, that they were not aſhamed to acknowledge him for their Lord and Saviour, who dyed upon the Croſs.* S. *Auſtin* ſaith, *uſque adeo de cruce non erubeſco, &c. I am ſo far from being aſhamed of the Croſs, that I do not put the Croſs of Chriſt in ſome hidden*

In Pſalm 141.

hidden place, but carry it on my forehead; and in another place he ſpeaketh of the Chriſtian, that *leſt he ſhould be aſhamed of the Croſs of Chriſt, he placeth it upon his forehead, which is the ſeat of ſhamefaſtneſs.* *Cyril* exhorteth, *Let us not be aſhamed to confeſs him who was crucified, let the σφραγὶς* (the ſign of the Croſs) *be confidently made upon the forehead with the finger.* And *Amalarius* ſaith, *we believe that we ſhall be ſaved by him who was crucified, of whoſe name the Jews are aſhamed,* --- and *therefore we make the ſign in our forehead, which is the ſeat of ſhame.* And to this purpoſe the uſe of this ſign by ſome of the Souldiers under *Julian* is accounted in *Theodoret* to be an expreſſion *τῆς χριστιανικῆς ὁμολογίας of the Chriſtian profeſſion.* And indeed when-ever the ancient Chriſtians uſed this ſign publickly (eſpecially when any one ſigned himſelf therewith) it always included a *profeſſion of Chriſt*: yet ſince through the bleſſing of God we live not among the *Gentiles* or *Jews*, who oppoſe the name of Chriſt, and have other *ſufficient viſible ſigns* of profeſſing the faith of Chriſt, in publick Aſſemblies of the Church; the uſe of this Rite to this end is no way needful to be continued among us; but becauſe it is liable to the *ſame dangér* with what I mention in the

De verb. Ap. Serm. 8.

Catech. 13.

Amalar. de Eccl. Offic. l. 3. c. 18.

Theod. Hiſt. Eccl. l. 3. c. 16.

the following particular, the diſuſe hereof is *uſeful* and commendable in the preſent ſtate of the Church.

3. Secondly, This ſign was moſt frequently uſed as an *expreſſion of hope and truſt in Chriſt crucified*, and of confidence in him, expectation of bleſſing from him, and ſupplication unto God by him. To this purpoſe both Latine and Greek Writers have paralleled this, with *Moſes liſting up his hands* when *Iſrael* was engaged with *Amalek*, which was a manifeſtation of devout application to God and holy confidence in him. And this uſe of this ſign was anciently very common in the actions of life, even in retirement and privacy, as is expreſſed by *Tertullian*. Thus S. *Chryſoſtom* directed the Chriſtian when he went abroad, that he might be in ſafety under the divine protection, *to diſclaim the Devil, and expreſs his adhering to Chriſt, with uſing the ſign of the Croſs*. When *Julian*, after his Apoſtaſie, was affrighted and terrified while he ſought to conſult with the Devil, as a remedy againſt his fears, *he ſigned himſelf with the ſign of the Croſs*, which *Nazianzen* expreſſeth χ τύτῳ σημεῖλαι χ βοηθὸν ποιεῖλαι τὸν διωκόμενον, which words ſhew his uſe of that ſign, to be a declaration of *flying for aid, and expecting help from Chriſt whom he perſecuted.*

De Cor. Mil. c. 3: Ad Uxor. l. 2. c. 5. Chryſ. ad pop. Ant. Hom. 21.

Naz. Orat. 3.

perſecuted. Upon this account this ſign was ſometimes anciently uſed in the *working Miracles* (as is expreſſed by *Nazianzen*, *Epiphanius*, and other Fathers) as a viſible teſtimony of confidence in Chriſt, which *Caſaubon* well expreſſeth, *Opem à Chriſto petiit, facto ſigno crucis, quod Primitivæ Eccleſiæ fuit ſymbolum ejus fiduciæ quam in Chriſto, & cruce ipſius & paſſione ponebant.* And whereas this ſign was long ſince uſed in every ſacramental adminiſtration, and ſome expreſſions of the Ancients have mentioned ſpiritual aid and grace to be conveyed *per ſignum crucis* by the uſe of this ſign, they hereby only meant that theſe benefits flowed from *Chriſts Paſſion*, and were obtained by a *Religious Application* unto him, as *Caſſander* aſſerteth. *Haud dubiè nil aliud ſignificare volebant, quam omnem tutelam & ſalutem in morte Chriſti eſſe conſtitutam, & ſacramenta omnia vim atque efficaciam ſuam, non aliunde quam à morte Chriſti haurire.* In like manner the Chriſtian Emperours from *Conſtantine* and downwards, made uſe of the *Banner* of *the Croſs*, as an expreſſion of their truſt in Chriſt crucified, and the ſame is related by *Bede* concerning *Oſwaldus* in *England* in his engagement againſt the *Britains.*

Caſaub. Exerc. 16. *in Baron.* n. 33.

Caſſand. in Hymn. Eccleſ. p. 220

Bed. Eccl. Hiſt. l. 3. *c.* 2.

4. Yet

4. Yet becauſe this ſign which hath been groſly abuſed to ſuperſtition, by placing an *operative vertue* and efficacy in the meer outward uſe thereof, would in this ordinary practice be ſtill very liable to the *ſame abuſe* by many perſons, or to be ſo *miſunderſtood* by others; becauſe they cannot upon every ſuch action declare their intent and end in that uſage, as is done in our Liturgy, when it maketh uſe of the *Croſs in Baptiſm*; therefore the diſuſe of this outward ſign as an expreſſion of Chriſtian Confidence, in order to the avoiding of that which is properly *ſcandal* (the producing corruption in Religion, and the ſin of man which is therein included) is altogether as reaſonable and fit, as was the ancient forbearance of the *Love-kiſs* and the *Agapæ* upon the ſame account.

5. Thirdly, The ſign of the Croſs was alſo generally made upon the foreheads of them who *were received unto the Church*. Hence in the inſtruction of the *Catechumeni*, they were every one of them told at their due time, *Paſſionis & crucis ſigno in fronte hodie ſignandus es, omneſque Chriſtiani ſignantur*; that he *muſt then be ſigned in the forehead with the ſign of the Croſs according to the manner of all Chriſtians*. And that this ſign was conſtantly attendant

Aug. de Catech. Rudib. c. 20.

attendant upon the admiſſion of members in the regular adminiſtrations of the Church is declared by S. *Auguſtin* upon *John*, and the ſame uſage is reckoned by S. *Baſil* among the Θεσμοὶ Ἐκκλησιαστικοὶ, *or the fixed Laws and Conſtitutions of the Church*; πῶς τύπῳ τῷ σφυρῷ τὰς εἰς τὸ ὄνομα τῷ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐπισφραγίδας καλασημαίνεσθαι· and when S. *Cyprian* ſaith, *in fronte ſignantur qui Dominum promerentur*, he thereby meaneth that they who are thought *worthy to be admitted to Chriſtianity, are ſo ſigned in their foreheads.*

Tr. in Joh. 118.

Baſ. de Spir. Sanct. c. 27.

Cyp. de Unit. Eccleſ.

6. The intent of this ſign in this uſe thereof was that the Church did hereby *ſolemnly teſtifie* thoſe perſons having relation to the *Chriſtian ſociety*, to ſtand obliged to *maintain the Chriſtian profeſſion* and life; and ſo far as concerned her authority, did hereby *dedicate or engage* them thereto, and *charge and require* them to be mindful thereof; and this was a token to *admoniſh* them that they muſt not be *aſhamed* to *confeſs* the Chriſtian Faith, and to *fight* under Chriſts Banner, and to ſerve and honour him. Upon this account the ſign of the Croſs was ordinarily called *Signum*, or *Signaculum Dei* by the Latine Writers; and by the Greek σφραγὶς, *the ſeal or mark* whereby theſe perſons were declared to be ſet apart to God,

God, ſo far as the Church had any *right over*, or *intereſt in them of her communion*. Thus thoſe words of *St. Cyprian*, *Muniatur frons ut ſignum Dei incolume ſervetur*, do exhort to Chriſtian *conſtancy and reſolution*, that they might thereby keep inviolable what was intended by this ſign on their forehead, which engaged them thereto. And when S. *Auſtin* checketh the Donatiſts, who confined the Kingdom of Chriſt to the narrow limits of ſome parts of *Africa*, ſaying, *Doſt thou call thy ſelf a Chriſtian, that thou mayeſt envy the Glory of Chriſt, cujus Signum in fronte teportare aſſeris, whoſe ſign thou declareſt thy ſelf to bear in thy forehead*, he thereby ſheweth, that this ſign was accounted to include an engagement or *admonition*, to promote and advance the honour of Chriſt. And that it might be a more plain Memorial of the Chriſtian faith and duty; when it was uſed to the *Catechumens*, ſome diſtant time *before their Baptiſm*, (of which *St. Auſtin* maketh frequent mention) the *abrenunciation* and *profeſſion of faith* were then joyned therewith, as appeareth from S. *Aug. de ſymbolo ad Catechum.* (the like unto which appeareth in our office of *private Baptiſm*) and when it was uſed at the time of the *adminiſtration of Baptiſm*, it immediately followed

Cyp. Ep. 56.

Aug. in Pſal. 85.

Confeſ. l. 1. c. 11. De pec. Mer. & Remiſ. l. 2. c. 26. Aug. de Symb. l. 2. c. 1.

followed upon the perſons *profeſſing* to undertake the Chriſtian life, as is expreſſed by the Author, *De Hierarchia Eccleſiaſtica.* And ſome dark intimation of this Primitive uſe of this ſign, may be diſcerned remaining in the *corruptions* of the Papacy, but the more clear expreſſion thereof is exhibited in our *reformation.* Dionyſ. de Hier. Eccl. c. 2.

7. This Sign uſed in our Church, upon any perſon in the office of Baptiſm, is declared to be *in token that hereafter he ſhall not be aſhamed, to confeſs the faith of Chriſt Crucified, and manfully to fight under his Banner, againſt ſin, the World, and the Devil, &c.* Which words ſpeak this ſign to be a *token by way of remembrance* of his duty to the perſon baptized, and a *teſtimony of engagement* upon him, and *expectation* concerning him from the Church. Which ſenſe of theſe words is made more manifeſt by the Canon, which declareth that it is *apparent in the Communion Book that the Infant baptized is by vertue of Baptiſm, before it be ſigned with the ſign of the Croſs, received into the Congregation of Chriſts flock, as a perfect member thereof, and not by any power aſcribed unto the ſign of the Croſs,* ---and it after addeth, that *this Church accounteth this ſign a lawful outward Ceremony and honourable badg* Can. 30.

Of other particular Rites appointed whereby the Infant is dedicated to the ſervice of him that died upon the Croſs. Now *dedicating* a perſon being an engaging or ſetting him apart unto God, and it being evident from the Canon, that this *dedicating* is wholly diſtinct from the *baptiſmal dedication* to be a Member of Chriſts Church, we muſt hereby underſtand the Church to engage this Member upon *her account* to the ſervice of Chriſt, in like manner as when any Father ſhall give himſelf to the Lord, as the *Macedonians* 2 *Cor.* 8. 5. did, and with diligent care ſhall warn and charge his Children, to yield and devote themſelves to God, this is properly caled his *dedicating* himſelf and his to the ſervice of God. And this ſenſe is yet more evident from the Office of Baptiſm, where the Miniſter baptizing (acting in the name of God) ſaith in the ſingular number, *N. I baptize*, &c. but ſaith in the plural number, *We receive this Child, and do ſign him, &c.* acting herein in the name of the Rulers, and other Members of the Catholick Church in Communion with us, the whole body deſiring and ſeeking the good of every member. So that hereby there is as great an *obligation laid* upon this perſon baptized, as the members of Chriſts body, and the power of his Church can lay upon him by their relation

relation to him, intereſt in him and authority over him.

8. With much agreeableneſs to this ſenſe Biſhop *Morton* declareth that *the Child is dedicated to God by Conſecration in Baptiſm which is a Sacrament of Grace: but the dedication which is ſignified by the ſign of the Croſs, is not by any proper conſecration to God, or tender of Grace received from God, by ſuch a ſign made: but is a declarative token of duty, which afterwards the perſon baptized ought to perform, concerning his conſtant and viſible profeſſion of the Chriſtian Faith.* Biſhop *Fern* ſaith, *it ſignifieth the duty of the baptized, and is to mind him of it*; and Mr. *Hooker* termeth it, *an admonition to glory in the ſervice of Chriſt*, and a *memorial of duty*, and a *Bar or Prevention to keep from Apoſtaſie.* *Defence of three Cerem. Par. Ch. 2. Sect. 7.* *Conſider. of Concernment. Ch. 7. n. 7.* *Eccleſ. Polit. l. 5. Sect. 65.*

9. Now beſides the *Sacraments* themſelves, it is very uſeful and needful to admit other means of *memorial* and ſolemn charge to engage men to the faithful ſervice of God, who are too prone to be negligent therein. Though all *Abrahams* Family were circumciſed, God had a ſpecial favour for *Abraham* becauſe he would *command his Children and Houſhold after him, and they would keep the way of the Lord.* And though in *Joſhua*'s time *Gen.* 18. 18, 19.

Josh. 24. 21, 22. the *Israelites* were circumcised, and kept the Passover, and had their Sacrifices, and publick general Assemblies before the Tabernacle; yet *Joshua* did further solemnly engage them to God, and set up a *stone as a witness* thereof. And when S. *Paul* mentioned the *good profession* which *Timothy* made before many witnesses, he thought fit to add a *solemn charge unto* Timothy *in the sight of God and Jesus Christ*; which requireth him to answer that profession. Wherefore since such a charge is in it self very useful; if as members we have that due value we ought to have for the body of Christs Church, that engagement, charge or expectation, which hath a concurrent force and influence, both from the Rulers and from multitudes of other members of that body, must be thought the most *solemn and weighty* of all other.

1 *Tim.* 6. 12, 13.

10. That in so considerable a case some *significant rite* is very expedient, to add to the solemnity thereof, is sufficiently proved by the common wisdom of Mankind, when they commit to others any great *charge*; and by the prudence of the ancient Church in this very particular. And this Rite of the *Sign of the Cross*, is upon many accounts very proper for this purpose; because it is apt to suggest

ſuggeſt to our minds the remembrance of the *name of Chriſt*, (which was anciently ſignified by *chi*, the firſt letter of χριστὸς, the old form of which letter was this (†) as appeareth from an ancient Inſcription produced by *ſcaliger*) and of the Paſſion of our bleſſed Saviour upon the Croſs, and of the nature of Chriſtianity in taking up his Croſs; and alſo becauſe it was a ſign to this end honourably uſed by the Primitive Chriſtians. And our Church hath taken abundant care to prevent all *ſuperſtitiouſneſs* in the uſe hereof, both by appointing it *after* the perſon is baptized, and received, as both the Office of Baptiſm and the Canon expreſſeth, and by the *Declaration* of its true intent and end, which is therewith expreſſed.

Scalig. Animad. in Euſeb. p. 110, 120.

11. I know that ſome perſons have aſſerted as from *Irenæus* that the Original uſe of the ſign of the *Croſs*, was received in the Church from the *Valentinians*, who uſed it as the *ſan of Chriſt* to purge away ſin: but theſe things are much miſrepreſented, there being nothing at all in *Irenæus* to this purpoſe. Only concerning the *Valentinians* (who indeed were no Chriſtians, but by a ſtrange medley from names uſed in *Chriſtianity* and *Gentiliſme*, and from their own fan-

Iren. adv. Har. l. 1. *c.* 1.

cies they framed a *Theogonia of Æones*, which they called their *Pleroma*) *Irenæus* with whom *Tertullian* agreeth, ſaith that the Keeper of this *Pleroma* was *Horus*, who among other names was alſo called *Stauros* or *Crux*, *Lytrotes* or *Redemptor*, and of him they interpreted thoſe words of S. *Matthew*; *his fan is in his hand.* So that all this referred not to the *ſign of the Croſs*, but to an imaginary perſon, who was an *Idol* of *Valentinus* his brain.

Tertul. adv. Valentin. c. 9.

12. But though the *true original* of the Chriſtian uſe of this ſign be above expreſſed, what is produced by the ancient Writers of this ſign being prefigured in the Old Teſtament, by the roaſting the *Paſchal Lamb*, the *Serpent* upon the Pole, the form of the *hands of Jacob* in bleſſing the Sons of *Joſeph*, and of *Moſes hands* being lifted up, which *Barnabas* expreſſeth, ἵνα ποιήσῃ τύπον σταυροῦ καὶ τοῦ μέλλοντος πάσχειν, is far more conſiderable than the miſtaken matter of this objection. And whereas the *mark upon the forehead*, *Ezek.* 9. 4. was accounted by *Theodotion* (and by *Aquila*, as *Origen* relateth) by the *Vulgar Latin*, and the *ancient Latin Verſion* uſed by *Tertullian* to be the mark of the Letter *Thau*, which is the word there uſed in the Hebrew: both St. *Hierom* who himſelf underſtood the *Samaritan* Character, which

Juſtin. Apol. 2. & adv. Tryphon. Tertul. de Bapt. c. 8. Adv. Jud. c. 10. Barnab. Ep. p. 136.

which was anciently uſed by the Jews, and *Origen* from the relation of a converted Jew, declare that the old form of the Letter *Thau*, was in the figure of a *Croſs*. And though *Scaliger* in his learned animadverſions upon *Euſebius* averreth, that this was their miſtake concerning the *Samaritan* Character; yet the truth of what they aſſerted, may appear from the *old Alphabet* collected out of their ancient *Medals* by Biſhop *Walton*, which is different from the Vulgar Characters, And I may add that the *Aaronical* Prieſthood under the Law which prefigured Chriſt, *received their Unction* in the form of the *Croſs*, or the Greek *Chi*, as both the *Talmud* and all the Jewiſh Rabbins do declare, thoſe *Rabbins* who ſeem to diſſent being reconciled to this aſſertion, by the reaſonable interpretation of *Simeon de Muis*. And the form or ſign of a *Croſs* was an *Hieroglyphick of the life to come* among the *Ægyptians*, and a *character of wiſdom* among the Platoniſts. And all theſe things ſpeaking an honourable uſe of *this ſign* before the time of Chriſt, though they were not chief reaſons of the *Chriſtians uſage*, might well be providentially ordered for the advantage of Chriſtianity, it being particularly related by *Sozomen*, that the *Converſion*

Animadv. p. 117.

Kerith. f. 5. *in Buxt. Lex Rab. in* תשוב

S. de Muis Var. Sacr. in Abarb. in Ex. 30.

Sozom. l. 7. *c.* 15.

Baron. an. 389. *n.* 99.

Juſt Mart. Apol. 2. *& Sylburg. ibidem.*

verſion of divers Pagans was occaſioned thereby.

Obj. 13. As for them who would charge this Rite becauſe of its ſignification, with being a new Sacrament, I have ſufficiently diſcovered the palpable erroneouſneſs of that conceit in a former Chapter.

14. And whereas ſome diſapprove this ſign becauſe it hath been *abuſed* by the Church of *Rome*, I have given a ſufficient anſwer to this in the fourth Section of the ſame Chapter. And he who would cenſure an uſeful and piouſly ordered *Sign of admonition* and memorial, becauſe a *ſuperſtitious operative uſe* of the ſame tranſient ſign is not allowable, muſt condemn things greatly different, as if they were the ſame. As if becauſe *Gideons Ephod* was abuſed, when it was made an Idol, the uſe of *an Ephod* by *Samuel*, and *David*, for the decent ſervice of God muſt be alſo inſufferable; and becauſe the *image of Cæſar* ſet up to be *worſhipped* is abominable, therefore his image *ſtamped* upon the *coin* muſt not be tolerated. And there is as much reaſon to condemn wholeſom and *profitable words*, from ſome perſons making an ill uſe thereof, as to condemn *uſeful actions and geſtures* for the ſame cauſe. *Ch.2.Se.1.*

15. They

15. They who cenſure this Rite, becauſe it is uſed ſo ſoon *after Baptiſm* it ſelf as an *attendant* thereupon, ſuppoſing that no ſignificative Rite may be lawfully received ſo nearly attending upon any Sacrament; they alſo build upon a very falſe and groundleſs ſuppoſition: as if the *Love-kiſs* and the *Agapæ* were not ſo uſed in the Apoſtolical times, with reference to the Lords Supper; and the *trinal merſion in Baptiſm* both in the Primitive and moſt reformed Churches. Yea I would appeal to every indifferent mans Conſcience, whether if a Father being ſolicitouſly careful of the eternal welfare of his Son, and having nurtured him in the fear of God, and lived to ſee him receive the Sacrament of the Lords ſupper, ſhould give his Son *ſome token ſo ſoon as he cometh from that Sacrament*, requiring him to keep the ſame, as a *memorial* of his Fathers charge upon him, to mind the ſervice of God, and the Chriſtian life and Unity, to which he is further obliged by the receiving that Sacrament; I ſay, I would appeal to ſuch a man whether he durſt condemn this action as ſinful, meerly becauſe this charge and token hath ſome reference to the *Sacrament*. And this Rite of our Church hath many advantages above this inſtance

ſtance, both in the higher *authority* of the Church, the greater *ſimplicity* of the rite it ſelf, and the *relation* it beareth to the pattern and example of primitive Chriſtianity.

16. Among the Proteſtants, the *Lutheran Churches* retain not only this, but ſome other Rites in the Office of Baptiſm, which are not received in the Church of *England*. And though many other Reformed Churches do not uſe this ſign, yet they condemn it not; nor do they herein cenſure either the Church of *England*, or thoſe of the *Auguſtane* Confeſſion. It hath been obſerved partly by Mr. *Hooker*, and partly by Mr. *Durel*, that *Goulartius* declared this Ceremony to be *indifferent* in its nature, but ſaid it was *not neceſſary* now for all Chriſtians to obſerve it; by thoſe words rather modeſtly *defending* the practice of *Geneva* (as Mr. *Hooker* expreſſeth it, in a way of *excuſe*) than expreſſing any diſlike of them who without ſuperſtition do retain it. *Iſaak Caſaubon* when he wrote his Exercitations, expreſſeth an approbation of this Rite in the Church of *England*. And *Bucer* in his *Cenſura*, declareth it to be an *ancient* and *ſimplex ritus*, *a pure or innocent Rite*, and that he judgeth the uſe thereof to be neither indecent nor unprofitable.

Goulart. in Ep. 56. *Cypr. c.* 7.

Exercit. in Bar. 13. *n.* 33.

Buc. Cenſ. c. 11.

17. I

17. I know there are ſome, who think their own apprehenſions ſo much above all others, that they are no otherwiſe moved by *teſtimonies* which are produced againſt them, than to expreſs their *cenſures*, and ſometimes their *contempt* of the moſt worthy Writers; and on this manner doth *Didoclavius* deal with the teſtimony of *Bucer* which I now produced; ſaith he, it is *frigida & diluta cenſura, nec ſatis expendiſſe videtur*, it *was his dull and weak judgment about this matter, and he did not ſeem to have conſidered what he wrote.* But let not ſuch think, that their *authority* is of any value to be put in the balance againſt the Primitive Church, and ſo many reformed Churches and Writers, and therefore there being no juſt cauſe from the conſideration of this rite it ſelf, and the uſe thereof to condemn it, the cenſure of ſuch perſons is *unjuſt and uncharitable*; and the diſlike of others who are more modeſt in their oppoſition is alſo groundleſs.

Altar. Damaſc. c. 10. p. 830.

SECT.

SECT. III.

Of laying on hands in Confirmation.

Didocl. Altar. Damasc. c. 5. p. 359. *Except. of Presbyt.* p. 29.

1. THis *Impoſition of hands* is the more oppoſed, becauſe of thoſe Declarative words in the Prayer uſed at Confirmation, *Upon whom after the example of the holy Apoſtles, we have now laid our hands to certifie them by this ſign, of thy favour and gracious goodneſs to them.* The Non-Conformiſts here will neither allow, that the *Apoſtles practice* ſhould be accounted any example for laying on hands in Confirmation, nor that this ſign may be uſed to *certifie Gods grace and favour*, which ſeemeth (ſay they) to ſpeak it a Sacrament.

2. Wherefore we are firſt to conſider, what warrant this impoſition of hands in Confirmation may claim from the *practice of the Apoſtles.* We read, *Act.* 8. 15, 17, 18. that after *Philip* had baptized at *Samaria*, by the Apoſtles prayer accompanied with *Impoſition of hands*, they received the Holy Ghoſt: and the ſame is related concerning the Diſciples at *Epheſus*, *Act.* 19. 6. Here we have an Apoſto-

Apoſtolical practice evident, that they *impoſed hands* and prayed, and thereupon the Holy Ghoſt was received. It is indeed acknowledged, that in thoſe inſtances there was a viſible and *miraculous teſtimony* of the preſence of the Holy Spirit, by *ſpeaking with Tongues*, &c. but the chief bleſſing of Gods ſpirit conſiſteth in the *inward Graces* of the ſpirit, which were not peculiar to that time; and that the obtaining the ſtrengthning grace of the Spirit, was in an eſpecial manner deſigned by the Apoſtles impoſition of hands, is declared by *Irenæus*; and it was juſtly eſteemed by *St. Auſtin*, that the *Holy Ghoſt is here received, where no miraculous gifts are beſtowed, but the gracious diſpoſitions of love, peace, and unity are entertained.* And prayer, eſpecially the moſt *ſolemn Prayer of the Biſhop*, or chief Officer of the Church, joined with impoſition of hands (which was a teſtimony of *peculiar benediction* uſed by dying *Jacob* and others under the Old Teſtament, and by Chriſt and his Apoſtles under the New) is a means to obtain this bleſſing, to ſuch who are diſpoſed and qualified for the receiving thereof: but that thoſe who indulge and give way to their corruptions and paſſions, (as the *Corinthians* did by their diviſions) could not

Iren. adv. Hæreſ. l. 4. c. 75. Aug. Tract. 6. in Ep. 1 Johan.

not receive the increaſe of the grace and ſtrength of the *Holy Spirit*, by the Apoſtolical *Impoſition* of hands, is alſo aſſerted in the place above-mentioned by *Irenæus*. And if any perſons will contend, that this *Impoſition of hands* now received in the Church, cannot be a practice according to the example of the Apoſtles, becauſe in thoſe times the Holy Ghoſt was oft *miraculouſly received*, which cannot now be expected; he may as well aſſert that the *Impoſition of hands* for Ordination, is not continued in the Church from the example of the Apoſtles, becauſe then the Holy Ghoſt was ſometimes extraordinarily given thereby; or that our *praying and preaching* is not a doing that, for which we have the Apoſtles for an example, becauſe we cannot by them expect ſuch *wonderful gifts* as ſometimes were conferred under the Apoſtles doctrine and by their prayer.

3. And by the ſearching into *Antiquity* we may diſcern the general uſe of this *Impoſition of hands* in the Church as from the Apoſtles. When the Apoſtle, *Heb.* 6. 2. ſpeaketh of the Foundation of the Doctrine of Baptiſms, *and of laying on of hands*, the ordinary expoſition of the Greek and Latine Fathers, refer thoſe words unto *Confirmation*, and in the ſame ſenſe

are

are they understood by *Calvin*, *Beza*, *Illyricus*, and many other Protestants. *Eusebius* relateth a story, wherein *Confirmation* was used under the name of σφράγις τοῦ Κυρίου, while *St. John* was yet alive: and *Cornelius* noted it as a defect in *Novatus* the Schismatick, that he never *obtained Confirmation from the Bishop for receiving the Holy Ghost*, which he calleth σφραγισθῆναι ὑπὸ τοῦ ἐπισκόπου, as his words are related in *Eusebius*. *Tertullian* in his short account of the Rites of the Church, after he had mentioned Baptism, expresseth Confirmatiou in these words, *Caro manus Impositione adumbratur, ut anima Spiritu illuminetur*; and in his Book *De Baptismo*, saith, that after Baptism is used *imposition of hands, calling for and inviting the holy Spirit by that benediction*. *S. Cyprians* testimony is yet more full, who saith that *for those whom* Philip *baptized, that which lacked was performed by* Peter *and* John, *by whose prayer and Imposition of hands, the Holy Ghost was invocated and poured forth upon them: which also* (saith he) *is now practised among us, that those who are baptized in the Church, are presented to the chief Officers of the Church, that by our prayer and Imposition of hands, they may obtain the Holy Ghost, and may by Confirmation attain to the highest Order of*

Eccl. Hist. l. 3. c. κγ.

Eus. Hist. l. 6. c. μγ.

Tertul. de Resur. Carn. c. 8.

De Baptism. c. 8.

Cypr. Ep. 73.

of *Chriſtians* (*or ſignaculo dominico conſummentur.*) *St. Ambroſe* ſpeaketh of Confirmation, that the *holy Spirit* is thereby obtained by *prayer*, *St. Hierom* approveth it for *Apoſtolical*; and S. *Auſtin* in divers places defendeth the practice hereof, with *relation to the Apoſtolical impoſition of hands*, and for the *receiving the Holy Ghoſt*, even when the miraculous gifts of the Spirit were no more communicated, and this impoſition of hands was enjoined by the ancient *Council of Elvira*, unto them who being baptized in caſe of neceſſity, did afterwards recover their health. And therefore this practice of the Primitive Church, as from the Apoſtles is abundantly ſufficient not only to *juſtifie*, but to *commend* herein the order of the Church of *England*, which agreeth thereto.

Amb. de Sacr. l. 3. c. 2.

Hieron. adv. Lucif.

Aug. cont. Donat. l. 3. c. 16. l. 5. c. 23. & Pſal. 130.

Conc. Elib. c. 38.

4. The uſe of *Confirmation* in our Church, beſides the leaving out things ſuperſtitious, hath *two great advantages* in its external adminiſtration. The firſt advantage, is in *the time* when it is performed, which is when the perſon is come to ſome *years of diſcretion*, and being inſtructed in the main Principles of the Chriſtian Doctrine, doth by his own actual conſent and promiſe renew his baptiſmal vow, and ratifie and confirm

firm it in his own perſon. For the increaſe and ſtrength of grace, which is then implored, and the being received to a higher rank of Chriſtian profeſſion, doth reaſonably ſuppoſe a *capacity of knowledge* and underſtanding. Indeed in the early times of Chriſtianity, while Baptiſm was ordinarily adminiſtred to perſons *adult*, the *Profeſſion* of their Faith, together with their taking upon them the practice of the Chriſtian life, went before their Baptiſm; and thence not only *Confirmation*, but the *Lords Supper* was ſoon after adminiſtred to them: and yet it is not amiſs obſerved by *Kemnitius*, that before hands were impoſed by St. *Paul* upon the Diſciples at *Epheſus*, there was ſome kind of *exploratio fidei*, or an *examining* of their Faith into which they were baptized. And acknowledged it muſt be that even *in Infants*, Confirmation was anciently in ſome Churches uſed ſoon after Baptiſm; but then the *Lords Supper* was alſo received by ſuch *Infants*, which was a blemiſh in ſome Churches as ancient as the time of S. *Cyprian*, is oft mentioned by S. *Auguſtin*, and four hundred years after S. *Auguſtin's* time, the adminiſtring the Lords Supper to Infants was directed by *Alcuinus*.

Exam. Conc. Trid. Part. 2. *de Confir.*

Cyp. de Lapſ. Aug. de Eccleſ. Dogm. c. 53 *Alcu. de Divin. Offic. Tit. De Sabbato S. Paſchæ.*

5. The Weſtern Church in the later

Centuries, hath ordinarily required in moſt of its Offices *ſeveral days diſtance* between the adminiſtration of Baptiſm and Confirmation, as *Durandus* declareth; who alſo in the ſame place is of opinion, that the ordinary cuſtom of the more ancient Church required a *perfect age*, or (as he expreſſeth it) the age of *twelve or fifteen* years, in them who received Confirmation; which opinion he groundeth upon the Canon *ut jejuni ad Confirmationem veniant perfectæ ætatis.* And that perſons who receive Confirmation ſhould have arrived at ſome capacity of underſtanding, was judged convenient by *Caſſander*, who alſo declareth the conſent of divers others of the Romiſh Communion. And herein the *Church of Rome*, ſince the Proteſtant Reformation, yea ſince the eſtabliſhment of the *Engliſh Liturgy*, hath receded from her former Rule of *confirming Infants*; and in the firſt Synod of *Millain*, which followed that of *Trent*, and in the Roman Catechiſm, it is required that thoſe who are to be confirmed, ſhould be at the leaſt *ſeven years old*, if not *twelve*, and ſhould be *inſtructed* with reference to their confirmation; and this alteration is approved by *Durantus*, with *ſumma ratione receptum eſt.* And herein the *after-wit* of the

Ration. l. 6. c. 84.

De conſec. diſt. 5. c. ut jejuni.

Conſult. Caſ. Art. 9. & de Hymn. Eccleſ.

Conc. Mediol. 1. de Confirm. Catech. Rom. de Confirm.

De Ritib. lib. 1. c. 20. Sect. 14.

the Romiſh Church hath entertained, what was with ſome deriſion rejected, in the ſixth Seſſion of the *Council of Trent*, as we are informed in the *Hiſt. Conc. Trident. lib.* 2. *p.* 194.

6. And ſomewhat analogous to *Confirmation at the years of Diſcretion*, may be obſerved from the *Jewiſh Church*; where when the Child came to be *thirteen years* old, the Father in a מנין or a ſacred Aſſembly of a compleat number for ſolemn occaſions, preſented the child before them, who having been taught both prayers and precepts of duty, he then undertaketh to be בר מצוה *one who taketh upon himſelf the obedience to the commands of the Law*, and *prayer* is then made for him, that he may grow up in good works. *Buxt. Syn. Jud. c.* 3. *Aben Ezr. in Gen.* 17. 14.

7. A ſecond *advantage* of our confirmation is, that here is a reducing the ancient primitive Rite of *Impoſition of hands*, which for many hundred years hath been *extruded* from the Romiſh confirmation, by other ſuperſtitious Ceremonies. And though *Durandus* be ſo *frivolous*, as to imagine that Impoſition of hands is contained in the *blow upon the cheek* (which was uſed in many Romiſh Churches after confirmation, but was not directed at all in the Office *ſecundum* *Durand. ubi ſupra.*

Bellarm de Confirm. l. 2. c. 2. *uſum Sarum*) and *Bellarmine* be ſo *vain* as to aſſert it to be contained in *Chryſming* the forehead, (which is the principal Romiſh Rite of Confirmation) wiſe men might ſee, that there is no more agreement in theſe things, than that the hand is made uſe of about them all. Wherefore this Rite of Impoſition of hands, was no Rite either *abuſed or uſed* under the corruptions of the Church of *Rome*, but was an innocent and uſeful primitive Rite *reſtored* in the Reformation of the Church of *England*. And even the Biſhop *holding up his hands* to pray over them which receive Confirmation, which the Cardinal would have to include Impoſition of hands, is neither required at all in the *Office of Confirmation ſecundum uſum Sarum*, nor is it mentioned among the preſent Rites of Confirmation by *Durantus*, and therefore it may as reaſonably be ſaid, that *Impoſition of hands* is included in all their prayers, as that it is contained in their Confirmation.

Bellarm. ibid. c. 2. 13.

Dur. de Ritib. lib. 1. c. 20.

Ratio Diſcip. c. 3. Sect. 3. 8. Among the reformed Churches, the *Bohemian* had confirmation with *Impoſition of hands*, which they did account an *Apoſtolical Rite*, and they (much after the manner of the Church of *England*) uſed therewith *Invocation of the Divine grace*,

grace, and a renewing their *Baptiſmal Covenant*: wherewith they alſo joyned *Abſolution*. And this *Comenius* both commendeth as the primitive practice, and ſaith that this way of Confirmation is ſtill *piouſly uſed* in ſome Churches. In the *Lutheran Churches*, even they who retained not this uſe of Confirmation, (as in *Saxony*) did yet eſteem it when adminiſtred with Impoſition of hands and prayer, unto perſons who being come to years of underſtanding, did make actual profeſſion of their engaging to Chriſtianity; to be *agreeable to the pureſt Antiquity*, and *the Apoſtles practice*, and to have exceeding *great profitableneſs* both for the edification of the Youth, and of the whole Church, as we may learn from *Kemnitius*, who was one of their chief Writers. And *Calvin* himſelf expreſſeth a like approbation of the ſame, declaring withal his deſire that *ſuch Confirmation* with Impoſition of hands might be *reſtored*.

Comen. Annot. in Rat. Diſcip.

Conf. Sax. de Conf.

Exam. Conc. Trid. Par. 2. de Confirm.

Calv. Inſt. l. 4. c. 19. n. 4. 13.

9. But it remaineth to be inquired, how the Church can *certifie* the perſons confirmed by the *ſign of Impoſition of hands, of Gods favour and gracious goodneſs towards them*. For the anſwering of which, waving other conſiderations, I ſhall obſerve two things. Firſt, that as

this impoſition of hands is a teſtimony of admitting perſons, to a higher rank of Chriſtian Profeſſors, who ratifie their baptiſmal Covenant by their own action, (intimating alſo an approbation of this profeſſion) it includeth the *power of the Keys*, whereby the Officers of the Church are enabled by Gods Authority, to declare particularly his *favour and gracious goodneſs* to them who embrace the conditions of Chriſtianity, and to direct them thereunto; and to this purpoſe was *Impoſition of hands* on the *Penitents*, at divers times, uſed in the ancient Church. And to *teſtifie Gods gracious acceptance* (either by our words or actions) of mens undertaking the exerciſe of Chriſtianity, is a thing greatly different, from the tendering the divine grace of Gods Covenant as *exhibited by any ſign*, as a means to *convey* the ſame, which is the proper nature of a Sacrament.

10. Secondly, This Impoſition of hands is a ſign of a *Benediction* in Gods name from the Officer of Gods Church. The *Levites*, and eſpecially the Prieſts under the Law, were required to *bleſs the people in the name of God*, *Deut.* 10. 8. 1 *Chron.* 23. 13. which bleſſing was performed in a way of *benedictory prayer* or ſupplication, *Numb.* 6. 23. and this bleſſing in Gods name,

name, was a Teſtimony of *Gods giving his bleſſing* to them, (ſuppoſing them not to render themſelves uncapable thereof) *Numb.* 6. 27. Theexternal teſtimony of their general bleſſing all the people, was moſt probably by *liſting up their hands* towards them, as is declared by one of the *Chaldee* Paraphraſts, and is obſerved by *Baronius*; and we have an inſtance of *this Rite*, attending the Prieſtly benediction, *Lev.* 9. 22. and our *Saviour* made uſe of the ſame, *Luk.* 24. 50. But in their ſolemn *particular benedictions*, in the Old Teſtament they uſed *Impoſition of hands*, of which we have an example, *Gen.* 48. 14, 16. in *Jacobs bleſſing the Sons of Joſeph*; this Rite was alſo uſed in their *Ordination of their Elders*; and the conſtant uſe hereof in the *particular benedictions* by perſons of great eminency among the Jews, is reaſonably eſteemed the cauſe why the Jews *brought little Children to Chriſt, that he might put his hands on them and pray*, *Mat.* 19. 13. And from the frequent practice of this Rite *Junius* and *Tremellius* have ventured to admit a Paraphraſe into their Tranſlation, concerning the Prieſtly benediction, wherein they expreſs the uſe of *Impoſition of hands*, in *Numb.* 6. 27. (which can only be allowed concerning

Targ. Jonath. in Num. 6. 23.

Baron. Annal. Eccl. An. 34. *n.* 220.

Grot. in Mat. 19. 13.

particular benedictions.) The end and design of Imposition of hands in benediction, is declared by *Ravanellus* to be *in testimony of the help, favour, and grace of God to be given to him who receiveth Imposition of hands*, and *Junius* saith, by this sign they were *to testifie to the people Gods grace*, which are Phrases much like those in this Prayer at Confirmation in our Liturgy. Yet this Rite was only a sign of Gods favour in this use, with respect to the *Benediction or Prayer* for that person, supposing and hoping him to be duly qualified, for the receiving the benefit therein desired, and therefore is of no Sacramental nature.

Ravan. Biblioth. Sacr. voc. Manus. Jun. in Num. 6. 27.

11. Now *Blessing* (including nothing Ceremonial, and Peculiar to the Law, and the Ministry of the Old Testament) is very suitable to the Gospel, which is in an especial manner a *Dispensation of Blessing*. And this Benediction or praying solemnly for Gods Blessing, was the chief thing designed in this *Apostolical Imposition* of hands with Prayer, and from their time this use hath been continued in the Christian Church, as hath been shewed; and it would be a strange, unreasonable, and uncharitable thing, if those who come to *renew their Baptismal Covenant*, might not receive the *Churches*

blessing

bleſſing in Gods name, with prayer for their Chriſtian growth and perſeverance. And the Dignity of *Office* in the Church, chiefly giving *authority to bleſs*, (according to that rule of the Apoſtle, *Heb.* 7. 7. *without all contradiction the leſs is bleſſed of the greater*) this ſolemn benediction at confirmation, hath thereupon been juſtly reſerved to the *Biſhop* or chief Officer of the Church, by whom alone it was performed in the time of S. *Cyprian* and S. *Hierom.*

12. Confirmation in our uſe thereof, is called by Biſhop *Whitgift*, *The Biſhops benediction by laying on of hands*; by Mr. *Hooker*, *This ſpecial benediction the Rite of Ceremony or Confirmation*; and when Confirmation was reſtored in *Scotland*, in the fourth Article of the Aſſembly of *Perth*, *it was declared* concerning Children who had been catechized, that *the Biſhop ſhould bleſs them, with Prayer for the increaſe of their knowledge, and the continuance of Gods heavenly grace with every one of them.* And the ancient Confirmation was accounted a *Benediction* by *Tertullian*, and a *Benediction of the Biſhop*, by the Council of *Elvira*. And ſince the Goſpel-diſpenſation is a *Miniſtration of Bleſſing*, and the great bleſſing of the Goſpel is to receive the *promiſe of the*

Biſhop Whitg. Defence p. 785.

Eccl. Pol. l. 5. Sect. 66.

Tertul. de Bapt. c. 8.

Conc. Eliber. c. 77.

the Spirit, Gal. 3. 14. This benedictory prayer upon a ſolemn occaſion, for the grace and ſtrength of that Spirit, was ſuitably accompanied in the practice of the Apoſtles and the Chriſtian Church, with the *ancient and proper token* of benediction, the *Impoſition of hands.*

Presbyt. Excep. p. 29.

13. But it hath been urged, that the Articles of our Church declare impoſition of hands in Confirmation, to be *a corrupt imitation of the Apoſtles practice*; and that *Confirmation hath no viſible ſign appointed by God, Artic.* 25. and therefore Impoſition of hands cannot therein *certifie* children, *of Gods favour and gracious goodneſs* towards them: and thus contradictions are injuriouſly impoſed upon the Church. The words of the Article to

Article 25. which they refer are theſe, *Thoſe five commonly called Sacraments, that is to ſay, Confirmation, Penance, Orders, Matrimony, and Extreme Unction, are not to be counted for Sacraments of the Goſpel, being ſuch as have grown partly of the corrupt following of the Apoſtles, partly are ſtates of life allowed in the Scriptures: but yet have not like nature of Sacraments, with Baptiſm and the Lords Supper, for that they have not any viſible ſign or Ceremony ordained of God.* The ſenſe of the former part of which words is, That the Church of

Rome,

Rome accounting *Confirmation*, *Penance*, *Orders*, and *Extreme Unction* for proper Sacraments of the Goſpel, their Errour herein proceedeth from their corrupting thoſe things which were practiſed by the Apoſtles; but their eſteeming *Marriage* to be a Sacrament, is a miſ-repreſenting a ſtate of life allowed in the Scripture to be a Goſpel-Sacrament.

14. The latter clauſe of thoſe words of the Article, do manifeſtly alike deny *Confirmation* and *Ordination* to have any viſible ſign or ceremony ordained of God, or that God hath not appointed in them any ſuch properly *Sacramental ſign* as Baptiſm and the Lords Supper hath. For in both theſe, the *Impoſition of hands* is immediately a repreſentation of a *benediction*, and of being thereby received into a higher degree among Chriſtians by the *miniſterial power* of the Church: and though *further grace* from God is needful in this higher degree, and humble and devout perſons may receive grace from God ſuitable to whatſoever ſtate he calleth them; yet grace is in theſe caſes to be expected in the uſe of *Prayer*, and from the *Promiſes* of Gods aſſiſtance to, and preſence with his people, and his Miniſtry; but not immediately from God, by the uſe of *Impoſition of hands*, as

an

an outward ſign, whereby that grace is directly *exhibited and conveyed*: and moreover proper Sacraments are *ſeals of Gods whole Covenant*, and means whereby he conveyeth both pardoning and ſanctifying grace. And I further add, that the acknowledging the ſign of *Impoſition of hands in Confirmation*, not to have any divine Inſtitution or *immediate command*, hindreth not its being of *Apoſtolical practice*, and that in the uſe thereof we may both follow the *example of the Apoſtles*, and *certifie Gods favour and gracious goodneſs* to perſons confirmed, according as is above expreſſed.

SECT. IV.

Of the Ring in Marriage. And the Concluſion.

1. The *Ring* was by the old Non-conformiſts called a *Sacramental Sign*, and a *New Sacrament*, and others ſince have expreſſed ſome fear, leſt the uſe of theſe words with the delivery of the *Ring*, *In the Name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghoſt, ſhould favour them who account Marriage a Sacrament.* But if this was an intimation of a Sacrament, a laſt Will and Teſtament, beginning *In the Name of*

of God, &c. and being *ſigned and ſealed*, muſt be accounted a Sacrament. And even among the *Romaniſts* who eſteem Marriage for a Sacrament, the *Ring* is not fixed upon for the *ſign or matter* thereof, but ſome fix upon the *perſons contracting*, others upon all *thoſe words and actions* whereby conſent is ſignified, others (as *Eſtius* ſpeaketh) *doubt* which of theſe to cloſe with, and *Bellarmine admitteth them both.* *Bellarm. de Matrim. Sacr. c. 6.*

2. Now though Marriage be in ſome ſenſe a *Religious Conſtitution*, as having its original inſtitution from God; yet both the nature of this ſociety and the end of it, ſpeak it a *civil ſtate* of Gods appointment, even as the ſtate of Government and Subjection is: and therefore as other civil contracts are eſtabliſhed by words of conſent, ordinarily attended with *real ſigns* or tokens; as with us ſome *Livery and Seiſin* is uſed in the paſſing over an Eſtate, and by the general conſent of the World, an *Earneſt* attendeth ordinary Bargains; ſo by a large conſent of Nations, hath a *Ring* been thought fit to eſtabliſh the Matrimonial contract, as a pledge or earneſt thereof. Whence it was an ordinary cuſtom among the *Jews* to uſe טבעת קדושין the *Ring of Eſpouſing*; the manner of its uſe among

among the modern *Jews* is expreſſed by *Buxtorf* in his *Synagoga Judaica*, and the ancient practice thereof is mentioned in the *Talmud in Kidduſhin*. Among the ancient and laudable cuſtoms of the *Roman* Empire, *Tertullian* reckoneth this for one, that Women then wore gold only on that one finger *quem ſponſus oppignoraſſet annulo pronubo, where the Bridegroom had put the pledge of the Matrimonial Ring:* and *Pamelius* upon that place of *Tertullian* (and *Baronius* alſo) obſerveth the like uſe of the Ring to be expreſſed by *Pliny*; to which purpoſe alſo are the words of *Juvenal*, who deſcribing Marriage, ſaith

Syn. Jud. c. 28.

Buxt. Lex. Rabbin. in קדש.

Tertul. Apol. c. 6.

Baron. An. 57. n. 51.

Juven. Sat. 6.

——— *Et digitis pignus fortaſſe dediſti.*

and *Theoſebius* in *Photius* calleth the Ring δακτύλιον ἁρμοστὴν παιδέρωτος συμβιώσεως, *the conjoyner of conjugal ſociety*. But though the uſe of this Rite in Marriage was very ancient even among the *Pagan* Nations, *Tertullian* aſſureth us it was *no part of their Paganiſm*; (ſaith he) *Neque annulus, neque conjunctio maritalis de alienjus idoli honore deſcendit:* but this pledge, and other common earneſts were prudently uſed long before the time of Chriſt, and are ſtill continued under Chriſtianity.

Tertul. de Idolatr. c. 16.

3. And that the principal uſe of this Rite

Rite is under the Chriſtian ſtate continued, to be an *earneſt of this Matrimonial Contract*, is not only manifeſt from thoſe ancient ritual words, mentioned by *Durantus Durandus* and many others, *Annulo ſuo ſubarravit me ſibi Dominus*, but from S. *Auguſtin*, who calleth it *arram ſponſi, the pledge or earneſt of the Husband*; and the ſame intent hereof is expreſſed in ſeveral teſtimonies cited in *Gratians Decretum*, *c.* 30. *q.* 5. *c. noſtrates Fœminæ. V. Gloſſ. in c.* 27. *q.* 2. *ſi quis.* And in our Liturgy, the giving and receiving a Ring is declared to be a *pledge of the Vow and Covenant, made between the perſons* who enter upon this ſtate of Marriage. And whereas theſe words, *In the name of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Ghoſt*, have ſome relation to the Pledge of Wedlock by the Ring (in our Office of Marriage) as it is a teſtimony of conſent to the Covenant of Marriage; the ſenſe and deſign thereof is to expreſs thus much, That this *Contract of Marriage in the Church*, is undertaken with reſpect to the Rules of the Chriſtian Doctrine, and the Inſtitution of God concerning Marriage, and by Authority therefrom, and in Subjection thereunto; and that by reaſon of this Inſtitution, the expreſſed conſent of the perſons contracting

Aug. Tr. 2. *in* 1 *Ep. Johan.*

cting muſt ſtand firm and inviolable; and therefore it is fitly and ſolemnly declared to be, *In the name of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Ghoſt*, in that being now *joyned together by God, no man can put them aſunder.*

4. But beſides this principal end of the Ring, the delivery thereof did alſo include a *giving authority to the Wife*, to command and take care of the goods of the houſe, and the proviſions which the ancient *Romans* uſually ſealed; and hence the *Ring* given in Marriage was a Seal-ring. Thus *Clemens Alexandrinus* calleth it a *Ring of Gold, given to the Woman but not for ornament*, ἀλλ' εἰς τὸ ἐπισημαίνεσθαι τὰ οἰκοι φυλακῆς ἄξια, *but to ſet a Seal upon what requireth ſafe cuſtody:* and in the ſame Chapter he ſaith, that *the care of the houſe is fitly committed to the Wife, and thoſe who have no wives may uſe the Seal-ring themſelves.* So he expreſſeth this ancient uſage of giving a Seal-ring: which may alſo not improbably be deſigned in the comprehenſiveneſs of *Tertullians* language, by his Phraſe of *Matrimonium obſignatum.* Concerning the cuſtom of the *Romans* ſealing their houſhold proviſions, *Pliny* telleth us, *Cibi & potus annulo vindicantur à rapina; Their meats and drinks were by the uſe of the Ring ſecured from robbery;*

Pad. l. 3. f. 11.

Tertul. ad Uxor. l. 2. c. 9.

Plin. Nat. Hiſt. l. 33. c. 1.

robbery: and that the moſt ancient uſe of Rings was wholly deſigned for ſealing, is declared by *Macrobius*, *Veteres non ornatûs ſed ſignandi cauſâ annulum circumferebant.* And that the giving a Ring was of old a teſtimony both of *ſpecial favour*, and of *committing authority*, appeareth by the inſtances of the Rings given by *Pharaoh* to *Joſeph*, and by *Ahaſuerus* to *Mordecai*; both which are confidently and probably aſſerted by *Boetius Epo* to have been Seal-rings; ſaith he, *Quod de annulo dicitur, utrobique de ſignatorio ſumendum eſt proculdubio, ad extollendam tam Joſephi quam Mardochæi authoritatem, ut quibus rex uterque concrederet omnia.* And though the cuſtom of *ſealing* things belonging to the houſe, and the uſe of a Seal-ring in Marriage is not with us continued; yet with reference to this ancient uſage, the delivery of the Ring may ſtill fitly import the Huſbands committing the things and affairs of his houſe, to the *care and authority* of his Wife.

Macr. Saturn. l. 7. c. 13.

Boet. Epi. Queſt. Heroin. l. 2. qu. 5. n. 21.

5. This Rite alſo did probably expreſs not only an honourable eſtate, (as Marriage is) but alſo a ſtate of *freedom and liberty* (the Ring in Marriage being uſed by them only in the former times of the *Roman* Empire, who were *Free-men* and

not *Slaves and Vaſſals*) whence it is declared by *Macrobius* in the place above cited, that no perſons under ſervitude might by the Laws of the Empire wear a Ring; *Jus annulorum famuli non habebant.* And the civil Law it ſelf doth in divers places declare, (treating *De jure aureorum annulorum*) that if any perſon who was no *Freeman*, obtained the *right of wearing a Ring*, he thereupon all his life time enjoyed the priviledges of the *Ingenui or Free men*, though he might not diſpoſe of what he had at his death. And *Gotofredus* giveth an inſtance from *Dio*, concerning *Muſa a Phyſician*, to whom *Auguſtus* gave a Ring, that he might enjoy this freedom. Agreeably hereto the *Ring in Marriage* may among us in ſome kind intimate a ſtate of *civil freedom* from vaſſallage and villainage in the perſons contracting, and may more particularly expreſs, that by the Matrimonial Contract, there is made over to the Wife a right of *Copartnerſhip* in the *Immunities*, and that degree of honourable eſtate, which the Huſband poſſeſſeth. But though theſe things laſt mentioned may well be admitted and allowed, the main intent of the uſe of the Ring, is to be a *pledge* or earneſt of the Marriage-covenant, as is expreſſed in theſe words;

Cod. l. 6. Tit. 8. Se. 2.

Digeſt. lib. 40 Tit. 10. Sect. 5. & Lib. 38. Tit. 2. Se. 3. n. 1.

Gotofr. ibidem.

With

With this Ring I thee wed. And this uſe of it was approved by *Bucer* as a thing very convenient, and Mr. *Baxter* hath declared, that he ſaw no reaſon to *ſcruple its lawfulneſs.* *Buc. Cenſur. c. 20. Diſp. of Cerem. c. 2. Sect. 43.*

6. And hence a good account may be given of theſe words, uſed with the Ring, *With my body I thee worſhip.* Which not only include the Huſbands honouring his Wife, but alſo declare that he taketh his Wife with her iſſue by him, into participation of that degree of *civil Worſhip*, *Dignity*, or *Freedom* which himſelf hath: and as this ſuiteth well the nature of their Union in being *one fleſh*; ſo it agreeth with the uſage of the *common Law of England*, wherein (otherwiſe than in the Civil Law) both the freedom and honour of the whole Family, dependeth on the Husband. And more eſpecially theſe words deſign to expreſs, the mans receiving this woman to be his Wife, in the *honourable eſtate of Matrimony*, ſo as ſhe ſhould enjoy that degree of civil worſhip and other Matrimonial Priviledges (as authority of guiding the Houſe, and commanding the Family, and a right of her iſſue being Heirs) whereby the honourable condition of a *Wife* or *Materfamilias*, was diſtinguiſhed from a *Concubine* taken in the beſt ſenſe, for one *L. Cokes Reports 5. Part Cawdreys Caſe.*

under a Matrimonial Contract (and therefore ſometimes called a Wife) but without the right to theſe Priviledges. Of ſuch *Concubines* in the times of the Old Teſtament, we have a frequent account in the holy Scriptures; the *Canon* Law giveth intimation of ſuch under Chriſtianity, and *Gellius* among the old *Romans* maketh a difference between ſome women, who were received into a ſtate of *Marriage*, but not in the moſt honourable degree thereof, and to theſe he alloweth the name of *Matrons*; and other Wives who were their *Matres-familias*, as having a diſpoſal of the Family, and a relation to the right of inheriting. And this Phraſe may alſo be allowed to ſignifie that the Huſband *hath not power over his own body but the Wife*, as the Apoſtle ſpeaketh, 1 *Cor.* 7. 4. And therefore the ſenſe of theſe words appeareth to be very conſiderable.

Grat. Decret. Diſt. 34. *c.* 3, 4, 5.

Noct. Attic. l. 18. *c.* 6.

7. And as to the word (*Worſhip*) it is here evidently taken for an expreſſion of civil honour, reſpect, and eminency, which was a more uſual acceptation of that Phraſe in the laſt Age, than now it is, as may appear from theſe words of Mr. *Tyndal*; *Concerning worſhipping or honouring, which two terms* (ſaith he) *are both one; the words which the Scripture doth*

Tyndall againſt Sr Tho. More.

doth uſe, in the worſhipping or honouring of God are theſe, to love God, cleave to him, &c. all which words (ſaith he) *we uſe alſo in the worſhipping of man, howbeit diverſly, and the difference thereof doth all the Scripture teach.* Nor is the word *Worſhip* in its common uſe ſo peculiarly now referred to divine Worſhip; but that beſides the ordinary title of *Worſhip* in a civil ſenſe given to men, we alſo read in the laſt Tranſlation of our Bibles, ſuch Phraſes as theſe, 1 *Chron.* 29. 20. *they worſhipped God and the King*; *i. e.* gave due honour, reverence, and obeiſance both to God and the King. *Luk.* 14. 10. then ſhalt thou *have worſhip in the preſence of them that ſit at meat with thee.* Rev. 3. 9. *I will make them come and worſhip before thy feet*: and in the ancienter Verſions there occurreth a much more frequent uſe of ſuch Phraſes. And therefore theſe words, *With my body I thee worſhip*, are not unallowable in the Phraſe, and are very ſignificant, comprehenſive, and of great moment, in their ſenſe, deſign and intent.

8. And now having impartially and diligently conſidered thoſe appointments in our Church, which for an hundred years paſt have been by divers perſons ſo *ſeverely cenſured* and oppoſed, (though by

by others *worthily defended* and juſtly valued) the reſult is this.

9. Firſt, that if theſe things were rightly and truly underſtood and apprehended, they would be well approved; and the vehement out-crys againſt them, and the *open ſeparation* from this Church upon this account, would appear unreaſonable and ſinfully uncharitable. And this right underſtanding is a matter of *no great difficulty* to intelligent perſons, (by whom others might be directed) who ſhall impartially make inquiry, having their ſpirits poſſeſſed with humility, meekneſs, calmneſs, and charity, unto which Chriſtianity obligeth all men.

10. Secondly, That though miſunderſtanding and miſtakes, or prejudices and a ſtrong affection to one party of men, and over-ſuſpicious thoughts of, and deſigned oppoſitions againſt others, may and do engage many to diſclaim theſe things eſtabliſhed, even to the preſent dangerous *breach of the Churches peace and unity*, and the extream *hazard* of its future welfare: yet nothing hath been, nor indeed can be produced, againſt the way of worſhipping God, eſtabliſhed in our Church, which either ought upon Principles of Conſcience, or according to the Rules of Chriſtian and Moral prudence,

prudence, to hinder pious men from *hearty joining* therein, or yielding *unfeigned aſſent and conſent* thereto.

11. Thirdly, That thoſe perſons who will reſolvedly oppoſe with *violence*, theſe eſtabliſhments in the Church of *England*, and *renounce its Communion* upon any accounts referring to the Liturgy, and way of Worſhip appointed therein, may obſerve that almoſt all the ſame things which they blame in our Church, and for which they injuriouſly depart from it, have been *received and appointed* (with many other things, which their principles do equally or more ſeverely condemn) in the Primitive Church, and eſpecially in the third, fourth, and fifth Centuries, (of the Rites and way of Worſhip, in which Ages we have more ample records than of the times foregoing) and had they then lived, they muſt upon the ſame accounts, according to their preſent Principles and practices, have diſclaimed the Communion of all the *famous known Churches* of the Chriſtian World in thoſe Ages, which have been, and deſerve to be greatly renowned. And this, beſides the former conſiderations which refer to the things themſelves, is of ſo great moment, that he who would have rejected

jected the Communion of those Churches must have thereby *disowned Membership* with the Body of Christ, and could never have reconciled such practices with *endeavouring to keep the Unity of the Spirit in the bond of Peace.*

FINIS.